

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 24, 1993

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us, O God, to see other people as created in Your image and entitled to respect and ultimate value. We see our family and friends as recipients of our concern and care and yet Your Word calls us to an understanding that reaches every person of every background and of every place. May Your good Spirit that opens our eyes to truth, lead us in the way of truth, so we respect and honor all Your creation, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

NO WONDER AMERICA IS LOSING JOBS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, no wonder America is losing jobs.

A Kansas City Federal courthouse is being built with granite mined in China. That is right, Chinese granite, even though there is an American quarry that produces granite within a stone's throw of this new courthouse.

A spokesman for our Government said that China got the contract because they are much cheaper. No kidding, Sherlock: Slave labor, child labor, no workers' rights, a dictatorship, and the average wage, America, is \$9 a month, not an hour, \$9 a month, and to kick it off, we give this dictatorship most-favored-nation trade status and the right to take our Government contracts.

We then wonder why we are broke and losing our keisters. Beam me up. It

is time to deal with China and everybody else, put them on a level playing field so we develop some jobs in America before we do not even have hamburger flipper jobs available.

TAX INCREASE WILL PRODUCE MORE SPENDING

(Mr. GILLMOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to talk about two myths that continue to pop up in the current tax debate.

Myth No. 1: Deficits were caused by the Reagan tax cuts. That is simply false, and the Government tax collections since that time prove it to be a myth. Figures from the Congressional Budget Office show Federal revenues, that is, tax collections, from 1980 to 1992 increased 122 percent.

The deficits were caused because Federal spending went up even faster, 234 percent, more than triple.

Myth No. 2: The tax increase is needed now to reduce the deficit. Tax increases under a Democratic Congress do not reduce deficits. There have been three major tax increases since the Reagan tax cut. People were told they were going to reduce the deficit, but the deficits were not.

The last tax increase passed by a Democrat Congress to reduce the deficit was in 1990. Since that time, the deficit has doubled, and spending has gone up.

Now, we have more of the same hokum from President Clinton. He has proposed the biggest tax increase in history on the average American family and it is not a tax increase to reduce the deficit. It is a tax increase for more spending, and it ought to be defeated.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to welcome all of our guests, but would like also to admonish them that House rules prohibit the expression of approval or disapproval of any statements made by Members on the floor of the House, and your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

INVITATION TO THE DRIVE AMERICAN QUALITY EVENT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the congressional automotive caucus, I would like to invite my colleagues to participate in the drive American quality event taking place on The Mall this week.

The event is sponsored by Chrysler, Ford, General Motors, and the United Auto Workers.

Starting tomorrow, Members will have the opportunity to test drive the latest American-made automobiles from the big-three automakers. As you may know, the American auto industry is making a comeback, recapturing a bigger share of the American market, and aggressively exporting American-made autos to other countries.

Auto industry analysts agree that a major reason for the big three's success has been the introduction of high quality, stylish new models. The drive American quality event gives Members of Congress the opportunity to experience the new models firsthand.

I hope you and your families can join us for this exciting event on The Mall.

APPOINTMENT AS A MEMBER OF COMMISSION ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 324(b)(6) of Public Law 102-392, the Chair appoints to the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Capitol the following Member of the House:

Mr. FAZIO of California.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S NEW TAX STRATEGY

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the President has tried everything to hide the fact that he is just another tax-and-spend, spend-and-tax Democrat.

Strategy No. 1 was to say he would only tax the rich. When he proposed a Social Security tax on those making as little as \$25,000, and an energy tax on everyone, he had to come up with another strategy. Strategy No. 2 was to not use the word "taxes," instead calling taxes contributions, patriotism, and responsibilities and even called Social Security taxes spending cuts.

Since America saw through both strategies, President Clinton fell back to old faithful—strategy No. 3: The

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

never-ending campaign. The only problem with strategy No. 3 was that he took it to Hollywood, the only place in the country that can either afford his taxes or agree with them.

So after three failures, President Clinton has evidently come up with a fourth strategy: Controversial White House firings and \$200 haircuts in hopes of getting America's mind off his taxes. It is a unique idea, but it will not work either. Instead, President Clinton should fire the administration's tax advocates and get his \$200 barber, Cristophe, into the White House for some spending cuts.

THE RECONCILIATION BILL: TAX FAIRNESS AND REAL DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this week we cast a vote on whether we allow the President to govern as the American people elected him to do.

His economic plan is the only game in town. The so-called bipartisan alternative coming out of the other body is not realistic. It protects the energy industry. It hurts the middle class, and it slams the elderly.

It may have the attention of the press and the drama of a challenge, but realistically it does not have the votes, so far only five in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this President's plan to go down.

We are once again showing how gridlock governs Washington. There are some in my own party who do not realize that we have a Democrat in the White House. The other side is united against the President no matter what.

Let us put politics aside and pass the President's plan and unite behind the President.

Mr. Speaker, if you have watched TV lately, you have heard an awful lot about the reconciliation bill. Unfortunately, most of what I am hearing is not true. What is true is that this is one of the fairest, most honest pieces of legislation we have seen around here in a long time.

After 12 years of smoke and mirrors, President Clinton has proposed a reconciliation bill that will cut the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years. The plan calls for real reduction—over 200 specific and concrete cuts. At the same time, it funds some very important and positive programs.

It includes a \$75 billion tax incentive for investment and jobs. It includes an increase in the earned income tax credit, a program that encourages the poor to work.

The bill does raise taxes but the burden falls on those who can afford to pay—about 75 percent of the net tax increase will be on upper-income Americans—about 5 percent of the population.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is doing what he was elected to do. Now we must do

our job and vote for the President's package. It restores fairness to the tax code, cuts the deficit and moves the economy in a positive direction.

CLINTON'S BTU TAX: BLEED THE UNDERCLASS

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is supposed to take up the largest tax increase in American history. This \$327 billion more-of-the-same monstrosity from the administration is another backward step on the road to prosperity.

The most onerous of the new taxes is the tax on energy, or Btu tax, which should stand for bleed the underclass. It will hit every American directly or indirectly, and it will hit the poorest the hardest. It could cost up to 600,000 jobs and \$475 per family by 1998 according to the National Association of Manufacturers. These 600,000 jobs lost will be the poor's jobs and the \$475 will be dollars the poor can least afford.

Last year when Mr. Clinton sought the Presidency, he spoke of fairness in tax policy. Now in full control of the political apparatus, we find out what the administration really wants from tax policy is more money to pay for more spending. This administration is not about fairness, it is about bigger Government, more spending, and more taxes.

□ 1510

DRIVE AMERICAN QUALITY

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. automobile industry has had a great impact on our lives and the American economy by supporting 1.4 million U.S. jobs and over \$50 billion in wages. This vital industry creates 15,000 jobs for every 100,000 vehicles produced. It also performs over 12 percent of all corporate research and development, is the biggest U.S. customer of small business and has a supplier, manufacturing, and assembly network involving 4,400 facilities in 48 States.

With all of this, the quality of American automobiles continues to improve, more people are buying and driving American vehicles, and American workers are responsible for and proud of these accomplishments.

To demonstrate this quality, from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m. tomorrow, and from 11 a.m. until 7 p.m. on Wednesday, the big three American companies and the United Auto Workers are hosting a very special event on Maryland Avenue directly in front of the U.S. Capitol.

This "Drive American Quality" event will feature an opportunity to test drive one of the quality 120 American cars and trucks, a luncheon on both days and a buffet dinner on Wednesday evening from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and their families to attend these important events and to drive American quality.

DEEP IN THE HEART OF TAXES

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think I have found the reason why President Clinton is so proud of his plan to pass the largest tax increase in history.

Apparently, he overheard Lloyd Bentsen singing a song that described an idyllic paradise.

What President Clinton heard was:

The stars at night are big and bright deep in the heart of taxes.

The time is right to make things right deep in the heart of taxes.

The time has come to spend a large sum deep in the heart of taxes.

But, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Bentsen was not humming about tax policy. He was thinking of his home State of Texas.

And given the latest polls in the Texas special election, the people of Texas are none too happy with President Clinton's tax plans. The stars may be bright, but the people of Texas are afraid when it comes to the heart of President Clinton's taxes.

CUTS VERSUS TAXES

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this week we have a simple choice: Are we going to burden the American people with the single largest tax hike in our history? Or are we going to cut wasteful Federal spending? Despite the technical and intentionally confusing mumbo-jumbo swirling around the Halls—despite the admonishment of the well-known big-spenders in this town, despite risk of being labeled "obstructionist" by the media—we can cut unnecessary spending and we can cut it enough to wipe out the need for the proposed energy tax and social security tax hikes. Together those new taxes would produce \$104 billion. Well, I have a list of cuts that could save \$104 billion so we do not need these new taxes. I and others will make this case on Wednesday in the Rules Committee, and if you do not like our cuts, pick some of your own. There is plenty of pork out there to chase down. It can be done—and it is something the American people de-

mand that we do. The energy tax will hit families, workers, seniors—just about everybody will pay more. The Social Security tax hike will hit seniors who are just trying to make ends meet.

Why do something so stupid to the economy as energy and our Social Security tax hikes when cuts of wasteful spending are such a smart choice?

CLINTON AND THE GOLDEN STATE

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton just got back from California. He told the people of San Diego that with his programs, and I quote: "I think you're going to see an enormous amount of new jobs in this State in the next 4 to 5 years."

But it turns out, Mr. Speaker, that they do not call it the Golden State for nothing. Because California is where Bill Clinton is getting the gold for his program of tax and spend. According to the California State Department of Finance, Californians will pay over \$11.6 billion more in taxes than they will receive from the Federal Government over the next five years. That is right, California will be a donor State, sending more to Washington than the State receives from the Government.

The President says he will create jobs in California. But with the massive Clinton defense cuts and now the tailspin in the aerospace industry, and the Clinton taxes on Social Security and energy President Bill Clinton converts the Golden State into a bankrupt State.

MAMMOGRAPHY BILL

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among women, affecting one in every eight.

Ironically, this deadly disease is treatable. Studies show that early detection through mammography screening offers a reasonable chance for treatment and recovery.

Through mammograms, it is estimated that death rates could be reduced by nearly 30 percent. Yet tragically, few utilize this procedure because they simply cannot afford it.

Thursday, May 20, I introduced legislation that will amend the 1986 Internal Revenue Code to provide an employer a tax credit for the cost of providing mammography screening for employees.

This incentive will encourage more employers to promote quality health care for their female employees.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation which better arms the working women of America in their fight against breast cancer.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM: ANOTHER CASE OF PUTTING SPENDING FIRST

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation we will be voting on this week includes a proposal for \$7 billion of additional spending on the Food Stamp Program over the next 5 years.

We have all heard reports over the years of the many ways the Food Stamp Program is abused. The wide majority of Americans support providing nutritional assistance to needy Americans, but are also wary of the readily apparent problems in this program.

During the Presidential campaign, President Clinton promised the American people to reform the welfare system as we know it, and this should have included food stamps.

Before requesting additional funds for food stamps, the administration should initiate a study of waste, fraud, and abuse of this program. This would ensure Americans who are paying higher taxes to increase spending on this program that their money is going to aid deserving recipients.

To many Americans, reports of abuse of the Food Stamp Program are the clearest example of a welfare system that needs to be reformed. Let us take a closer look about how this money is being spent before taxing and borrowing more from our children.

BALANCE BUDGET BY CUTTING FIRST

(Mr. HOEKSTRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 weeks, I have been spending my time wondering how the President and the Democrats in this House can go to the American people and say that raising taxes \$250 billion is not really that much money. I have also watched and listened to the President saying that an \$80 billion Btu tax, directly affecting the middle class, is not that much money, which \$450 per year in the Btu tax to the average American family is not that big of a deal. Well, last week I found out: \$450 is only the price of two haircuts.

The fact is that the President has misunderstood the American people. He has misunderstood where the American middle class is today.

The American people want Government to spend less. The American peo-

ple want smaller Government. We can and should start this process of balancing the budget by cutting first.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, there are many good reasons to support the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. It is something which could open vast markets in North America for goods made by U.S. men and women. It could solve a lot of foreign policy problems that we might have among the three nations on North America.

But there are three elements, Mr. Speaker, that must be taken into careful consideration. One is to be sure that the ancillary agreements to the trade agreement which are being hammered out, dealing with worker rights and with safety in the plant and with environmental considerations, are tight and enforceable.

□ 1520

The second thing is a field in which I have studied some, on immigration, to be sure that the more open borders and the more free passage under NAFTA does not lead to wholesale entry of people into this country without legal papers.

And the third element is, today's New York Times carries a front page story about reports from United States intelligence people who say that open borders could very well lead to more drug trafficking of Colombian cocaine through Mexico into the United States.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the North American Free-Trade Agreement should not unwittingly lead to any elements of harm to the United States, and we must, therefore, look very carefully at that agreement and all of the ancillary agreements to it.

THIS ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT NEED HELP BEING EMBARRASSED

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, there are some Democrats who are saying that there is a partisan conspiracy, trying to embarrass the President on his economic plan.

Let me explain a fact to everyone that is painfully evident to the rest of America: This administration does not need any help in embarrassing itself.

The Clinton administration has become known for high-priced haircuts and no spending cuts. It breaks a promise a day. When, on April 15, the White House celebrated tax day by going back on its word yet, again, and coying up

to the idea of a VAT tax on top of the biggest tax increase in American history, how did they explain it? Well, the President's press spokesman came out and said, "The President has a right to change his mind."

He does have a right to change his mind. This administration changes its mind like the rest of Americans changes socks.

In fact, it seems that the only thing one can count on from this administration is that it will not do what it says, and that it will do whatever taxes more Americans' income and spending, more of the American people's money seems to be the only thing that this administration is good at.

Do not blame partisan conspiracies for opposing taxes and opposing the spending increases on the American people. Please do not try to accuse any of us trying to embarrass the administration. They are proving they can do that very well on their own.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after consideration of House Resolution 172.

VETERANS EDUCATION OUTREACH PROGRAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 996) to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a veterans education certification and outreach program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. VETERANS EDUCATION OUTREACH PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter II the following new section:

"§3697B. Veterans education outreach program

"(a) The Secretary shall provide funding for offices of veterans affairs at institutions of higher learning, as defined in section 3452(f), in accordance with this section.

"(b)(1)(A) The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, make payments to any institution of higher learning, under and in accordance with this section, during any fiscal year if the number of persons eligible for services from offices assisted under this section at the institution is at least 50, determined in the same manner as the number of eligible veterans or eligible persons is determined under section 3684(c).

"(B) The persons who are eligible for services from the offices assisted under this section are persons receiving educational assistance administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, including assistance provided under chapter 106 of title 10.

"(2) To be eligible for a payment under this section, an institution of higher learning or a consortium of institutions of higher learning, as described in paragraph (3), shall make an application to the Secretary. The application shall—

"(A) set forth such policies, assurances, and procedures that will ensure that—

"(i) the funds received by the institution, or each institution in a consortium of institutions described in paragraph (3), under this section will be used solely to carry out this section;

"(ii) for enhancing the functions of its veterans education outreach program, the applicant will expand, during the academic year for which a payment is sought, an amount equal to at least the amount of the award under this section from sources other than this or any other Federal program; and

"(iii) the applicant will submit to the Secretary such reports as the Secretary may require or as are required by this section;

"(B) contain such other statement of policies, assurances, and procedures as the Secretary may require in order to protect the financial interests of the United States;

"(C) set forth such plans, policies, assurances, and procedures as will ensure that the applicant will maintain an office of veterans' affairs which has responsibility for—

"(i) veterans' certification, outreach, recruitment, and special education programs, including the provision of or referral to educational, vocational, and personal counseling for veterans; and

"(ii) providing information regarding other services provided veterans by the Department, including the readjustment counseling program authorized under section 1712A, the programs of veterans employment and training authorized under the Job Training Partnership Act and the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act of 1992, and the programs carried out under chapters 41 and 42; and

"(D) be submitted at such time or times, in such manner, in such form, and contain such information as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary under this section.

"(3) An institution of higher learning which is eligible for funding under this section and which the Secretary determines cannot feasibly carry out, by itself, any or all of the activities set forth in paragraph (2)(C), may carry out such program or programs through a consortium agreement with one or more other institutions of higher learning in the same community.

"(4) The Secretary shall not approve an application under this subsection unless the Secretary determines that the applicant will implement the requirements of paragraph (2)(C) within the first academic year during which it receives a payment under this section.

"(5) Any institution which received funding under section 420A of the Higher Edu-

cation Act of 1965 during fiscal year 1993 shall be eligible under this section for fiscal year 1994.

"(c)(1)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the amount of the payment which any institution shall receive under this section for any fiscal year shall be \$100 for each person who is described in subsection (b)(1)(B).

"(B) The maximum amount of payments to any institution of higher learning, or any branch thereof which is located in a community which is different from that in which the parent institution thereof is located, in any fiscal year is \$75,000.

"(2)(A) The Secretary shall pay to each institution of higher learning which has had an application approved under subsection (b) the amount which it is to receive under this section. If the amount appropriated for any fiscal year is not sufficient to pay the amounts which all such institutions are to receive, the Secretary shall ratably reduce such payments. If any amount becomes available to carry out this section for a fiscal year after such reductions have been imposed, such reduced payments shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced.

"(B) In making payments under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall apportion the appropriation for making such payments, from funds which become available as a result of the limitation on payments set forth in paragraph (1)(B), in an equitable manner.

"(d) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this section, shall seek to assure the coordination of programs assisted under this section with other programs carried out by the Department pursuant to this title, and the Secretary shall provide all assistance, technical consultation, and information otherwise authorized by law as necessary to promote the maximum effectiveness of the activities and programs assisted under this section.

"(e)(1) From the amounts made available for any fiscal year under subsection (f), the Secretary shall retain one percent or \$10,000, whichever is less, for the purpose of collecting information about exemplary veterans educational outreach programs and disseminating that information to other institutions of higher learning having such programs on their campuses. Such collection and dissemination shall be done on an annual basis.

"(2) From the amounts made available under subsection (f), the Secretary may retain not more than two percent for the purpose of administering this section.

"(f) There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3697A the following new item:

"3697B. Veterans education outreach program."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous matter, on the bill now being considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 996, as amended.

This bill would transfer the Veterans Education Certification and Outreach Program from the Department of Education, and continue it in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 996 would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide seed money to help counselors assist veterans at colleges;

It would require that veterans' affairs offices at participating schools provide services in veterans' certification, outreach, counseling, and special education programs to eligible veterans.

To qualify, Mr. Speaker, for this assistance, a participating school must have at least 50 veterans receiving VA education assistance and the school must match the VEOP funds, which means Veterans Education Outreach Program. Of the 500 colleges receiving VEOP grants last year, most were small schools and community colleges, 2-year colleges.

This program has provided valuable assistance to veteran students. Counselors conduct outreach activities to maximize usage of GI bill benefits; they counsel veterans regarding vocational choices; they assure prompt certification for VA education benefits; and they assist veterans in interpreting VA education-related regulations.

As the downsizing of the military continues, Mr. Speaker, there will be a significant increase in the number of veteran students on college campuses. As a result, there will be an increasing need for the services provided under this program.

The bill, as amended, is authorized so it would have no "pay go" effect.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], who is the ranking member of the committee, for his support and help and also commend the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

This is a very important piece of legislation to help veterans pursue their education.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 996.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 996, which would transfer the Veterans Education Outreach Program from the

Department of Education to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Having this program at the VA makes sense, because the counseling and outreach for veterans education programs, such as the Montgomery GI bill, can be done better by the Department which runs them.

What I do not want to see is higher priority VA programs losing funding to support a new program. The bill addresses this concern by making the funding authorization subject to appropriations. As our active duty military forces are reduced, the Veterans Education Outreach Program would be a good adjunct to the Transition Assistance Program for the increasing numbers of separating service members, if new funding can be found.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will give H.R. 996 their favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 996. Educational assistance today is one of the most important benefits for those who choose to serve their country in the Armed Forces. It is unfortunate that some recent veterans are not taking advantage of programs such as the Montgomery GI bill. They have earned this benefit, they deserve this benefit, and it is an extremely valuable one. This is particularly frustrating in cases where nonuse is due to lack of assistance regarding a veteran's rights and benefits. H.R. 996 would address this with the VEOP program of counseling assistance and outreach which has helped so many veterans in the past.

In light of the constrained VA budget, it is important that we move cautiously in enacting any program which could spread the limited resources of the VA even further. By making the VEOP funding subject to appropriations, I am assured that its cost will not adversely affect more vital responsibilities.

As our active duty military forces are downsized, VEOP will provide important assistance for the increasing numbers of separating service men and women. I thank Chairman MONTGOMERY and ranking member STUMP for their efforts to bring this legislation before us. I recommend that my colleagues support H.R. 996.

□ 1530

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of H.R. 996, the Veterans Education Outreach Program. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gen-

tleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for introducing this beneficial veterans legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 996 is legislation that will assist in providing education for our Nation's veterans. By amending title 38 of the United States Code, this measure will reestablish the Veterans Education Outreach Program [VEOP] as part of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Currently, the Veterans Education Outreach Program is managed by the Department of Education. However, the VEOP program was repealed by Public Law 102-35, and, accordingly, the appropriations are scheduled to expire on June 30, 1993. As amended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 996 will reestablish this beneficial program, and will provide an indefinite authorization of \$3 million. This measure would be effective upon the date of enactment.

In previous years, the Veterans Education Outreach Program has provided assistance to many eligible honorably discharged veterans. By staffing college campuses with VEOP coordinators, eligible veterans are provided with valuable information regarding the various educational programs and entitlement that are offered by the VA. In fact, recent reports demonstrate that in 1992: 169,081 veterans received assistance under this program.

And, over 500 VEOP grants, averaging approximately \$5,000 were provided to institutions of higher learning.

As outlined in H.R. 996, the VEOP will continue to provide an important educational assistance to eligible service men and women who have so valiantly supported the United States. Specifically:

H.R. 996 will require that, in order to qualify for a VEOP grant, an institute of higher learning must have a minimum of 50 enrolled and eligible veterans. This is a reduction from the current law which states that at least 100 eligible veterans must be enrolled;

H.R. 996 will designate that every veteran that receives VA educational assistance is eligible for VEOP assistance. As opposed to current provisions, H.R. 996 will provide educational benefits to eligible active duty service members and members of the Selected Reserve;

And H.R. 996 will simplify educational payments by establishing a set payment schedule of \$100 per eligible veteran;

While this measure will result in outlays, the Congressional Budget Office has stated that this measure will not affect direct spending, I believe this is a small price to pay as we continue to assist our veterans as they face the challenges and changing needs of America today.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 996. I believe the Veterans Education Outreach Program will continue to assist our Nation's veterans to reach

their highest potential. Our Nation places great value in a solid education. By providing educational grants and entitlement, our veterans will be prepared to address the demands of today and the challenges of tomorrow.

I commend the significant work of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Under the leadership of its distinguished leader, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and its ranking Republican leader, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], this Congress has demonstrated that our Nation supports our veterans. H.R. 996 as well as the other legislative measures that have already been approved by the 103d Congress, confirm this commitment. While we must continue to realize the financial constraints that face our Nation, I hope that my colleagues will join with me, as we continue to focus on providing beneficial programs and valuable services to our Nation's veterans. They deserve no less.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and also the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON]. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle for the kind words they have said about this legislation. We have a good bill here. We have the blue sheets that we have at the desk that further explain the bill. I hope Members will pick up these sheets.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a full vote on this program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 996, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PAY ACT

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1723) to authorize the establishment of a program under which employees of the Central Intelligence Agency may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, re-

organization, transfer of function, or other similar action, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1723

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act".

SEC. 2. SEPARATION PAY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of Central Intelligence; and

(2) the term "employee" means an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency, serving under an appointment without time limitation, who has been currently employed for a continuous period of at least 12 months, except that such term does not include—

(A) a reemployed annuitant under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, or another retirement system for employees of the Government; or

(B) an employee having a disability on the basis of which such employee is or would be eligible for disability retirement under any of the retirement systems referred to in subparagraph (A).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—In order to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action, the Director may establish a program under which employees may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily (whether by retirement or resignation). An employee who receives separation pay under such program may not be reemployed by the Central Intelligence Agency for the 12-month period beginning on the effective date of the employee's separation.

(c) BAR ON CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT.—

(1) BAR.—An employee may not be separated from service under this section unless the employee agrees that the employee will not—

(A) act as agent or attorney for, or otherwise represent, any other person (except the United States) in any formal or informal appearance before, or with the intent to influence, make any oral or written communication on behalf of any other person (except the United States) to the Central Intelligence Agency; or

(B) participate in any manner in the award, modification, extension, or performance of any contract for property or services with the Central Intelligence Agency.

during the 12-month period beginning on the effective date of the employee's separation from service.

(2) PENALTY.—Any employee who violates an agreement under this subsection shall be liable to the United States in the amount of the separation pay paid to the employee pursuant to this section times the proportion of the 12-month period during which the employee was in violation of the agreement.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—Under this program, separation pay may be offered only—

(1) with the prior approval of the Director; and

(2) to employees within such occupational groups or geographic locations, or subject to such other similar limitations or conditions, as the Director may require.

(e) AMOUNT AND TREATMENT FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—Such separation pay—

(1) shall be paid in a lump sum;

(2) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) an amount equal to the amount the employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of title 5, United States Code, if the employee were entitled to payment under such section; or

(B) \$25,000;

(3) shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation, of any other type of Government benefit; and

(4) shall not be taken into account for the purpose of determining the amount of any severance pay to which an individual may be entitled under section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, based on any other separation.

(f) TERMINATION.—No amount shall be payable under this section based on any separation occurring after September 30, 1997.

(g) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(h) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) OFFERING NOTIFICATION.—The Director may not make an offering of voluntary separation pay pursuant to this section until 30 days after submitting to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report describing the occupational groups or geographic locations, or other similar limitations or conditions, required by the Director under subsection (d).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—At the end of each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1997, the Director shall submit to the President and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on the effectiveness and costs of carrying out this section.

SEC. 3. EARLY RETIREMENT FOR CIARDS AND FERS SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS.

Section 233 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2053) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before "A participant"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) A participant who has at least 25 years of service, ten years of which are with the Agency, may retire, with the consent of the Director, at any age and receive benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 221 if the Office of Personnel Management has authorized separation from service voluntarily for Agency employees under section 8336(d)(2) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the Civil Service Retirement System or section 8414(b)(1)(B) of such title with respect to the Federal Employees' Retirement System."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I introduced H.R. 1723 on April 20 at the administration's request. That we are able to consider the bill on the House floor slightly more than a month after its introduction is a tribute to the dedicated efforts of the chairman of our Subcommittee on Legislation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS]. They are to be commended for the cooperative spirit with which they have worked with the Director of Central Intelligence to produce a measure which could be brought expeditiously to the House floor.

In the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1993, Congress signaled its judgment that personnel levels in the intelligence community were too high by mandating a 17.5-percent reduction in the work force. This reduction is to be accomplished, in stages, by 1997. When the personnel cuts were proposed, the Intelligence Committee indicated its strong preference for accomplishing them without resorting to involuntary separations, or reductions-in-force.

In seeking to comply with this congressional directive, the intelligence community, as did the Defense Department before it, discovered that attrition is a reliable tool to effect reductions in personnel only if the economy to which the retirees are headed is healthy. If economic trends are unsettled, employees do not generally opt to leave their jobs, unless some type of incentive is provided. The Secretary of Defense has statutory authority to provide voluntary separation incentives to civilian employees of the Department, including those employed by defense intelligence agencies. H.R. 1723 provides similar authority to the Director of Central Intelligence for civilian employees at the Central Intelligence Agency.

The bill will produce two important results. First, it will assist the Agency in meeting its mandated personnel reduction ceilings. In addition, it will hopefully reduce personnel levels further than required so that new employees, with the skills necessary to meet the intelligence challenges of the future, can be hired without exceeding the ceilings.

I want to emphasize that the incentives to be provided by H.R. 1723 will be available only to CIA employees in certain occupational groups or geographic locations to be designated as "surplus." This designation is a reflection that the end of the cold war has brought to the intelligence community, as it has to other parts of the national security establishment, a need to re-examine the mix of skills in its work force. Employees whose expertise is no longer in demand must either be retrained, if possible, or be encouraged to retire or resign so that those with the skills necessary for the future can be recruited. H.R. 1723 will be a tool in not only shrinking the size of the CIA, but in reorienting it from its cold war focus and methods.

To ensure that the incentives are directed only at surplus employees, the bill prohibits the re-employment of any individual receiving a separation pay incentive for 12 months from the

date of separation. Similarly, employees receiving a separation pay incentive will be prohibited from representing a party, other than the United States, before the CIA, or participating in the award or performance of any contract with the CIA. In addition, it is the committee's intention that separation pay incentives be awarded to an employee on a one-time-only basis regardless of whether the employee subsequently qualifies for re-employment with the CIA.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1723 will enhance the ability of the Director of Central Intelligence to reshape the CIA's work force in a sensible fashion. While there are some initial costs, in the long run the bill will save money through reductions in salaries, benefits, and the size of annuities. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which will contribute to the paring down of the personnel rolls at the CIA in a manner which is effective and fair.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, for his description of this bill and for moving this bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it. The Director of Central Intelligence, James Woolsey, appeared before our committee on the 23d of April and outlined clearly why the CIA requires this legislation. It is designed to enable the CIA to hire new employees to meet the intelligence challenges of the 1990's, while simultaneously achieving a significant overall personnel reduction by the end of fiscal year 1997. It will facilitate the identification of categories of employees where there is a surplus and permit the CIA to pay each of these employees up to \$25,000 on a one-time basis to retire or resign.

It is important to note that the CIA is in a special situation because its employees all hold top-secret clearances and have access to very sensitive information. Given that this is a voluntary program, this bill would minimize any potential counterintelligence risk arising from their being targeted by hostile foreign intelligence services. One area about which I am very sensitive is the fact that the CIA has made considerable progress in hiring minorities and women. This bill is sensitive to those gains while ensuring no one group is shown favoritism as the CIA begins the painful process of personnel reductions.

In conclusion, I again emphasize my strong support for this bill. It is carefully crafted to meet the needs of the CIA, minimize the cost of the American taxpayer, and ensure that the CIA is capable of meeting the new and very difficult intelligence challenges that it will face throughout the 1990's. This is good management. This is good sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1723. It is a carefully crafted piece of legislation that meets the needs of the CIA to reduce the overall size of its work force in a carefully planned 5-year, phased downsizing. This plan is designed to avoid, where possible, involuntary terminations of CIA personnel and give them a cash incentive to retire or resign early. It will remove from the CIA work force employees who fall into surplus categories. Many of these personnel have become surplus as a result of the end of the cold war and the changed threat that the U.S. faces.

The Soviet Union is no longer the monolithic problem that we faced from the end of the World War II to 1989. Responding to the changed threat, former Director of Central Intelligence, Bob Gates, and the current DCI, James Woolsey, found that the CIA had to change its skills mix in order to focus more on problems such as proliferation, terrorism, and narcotics and hire new personnel with specialized skills. In order to do that in a reduced budgetary environment, the CIA has designed a plan to encourage employees to retire early to make room for new employees with other skills and to reduce the overall size of its work force. This bill will achieve both goals, and I strongly support it and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

□ 1540

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, first I commend the new chairman of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member for producing a good bill, one that will enable us to move ahead into the intelligence challenges of the 1990's.

This legislation authorizes the Director of CIA to implement a program whereby certain CIA employees will be offered cash incentives to voluntarily resign or retire from the agency.

Why is this legislation important? It basically is important because it means that we now will be able to hire those new recruits, new people with new skills to develop the new mission of the Central Intelligence Agency. In the past, many of the employees at the CIA have been geared toward the cold war, toward the Soviet Union's specialities, and we need new recruits for the new challenges facing this country, nuclear nonproliferation, economic competition, counternarcotics, Arabists, experts on the Middle East and Africa. We need this good management tool to move ahead and be able to recruit some new people with new skills into the agency.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1993 Intelligence Authorization Act mandated

that the intelligence community reduce its personnel by 17.5 percent by the end of fiscal year 1997. At the time the fiscal year 1993 Intelligence Authorization Act was being debated, the Central Intelligence Agency was experiencing their traditional levels of attrition. Agency managers informed the intelligence committees that the CIA would be able to meet its reduction targets through the normal rate of attrition. However, Mr. Speaker, a sluggish economy accompanied by reduced employment opportunities in both the private and public sectors has resulted in falling attrition rates at CIA.

Despite low attrition rates, CIA maintains their ability to meet fiscal year 1993 personnel levels, although it will be at the expense of hiring new persons possessing skills critical to the future mission of the CIA. The collapse of the former Soviet Union and the resulting end of the Cold War has created new demands on our Nation's intelligence agencies and entities. In order to meet these challenges, the CIA must employ those persons trained in the academic disciplines which figure prominently in future intelligence requirements. If the CIA is unable to recruit such individuals. Then our entire future will be placed in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1723 provides the Director of Central Intelligence a management tool to assist in reducing the Agency's personnel levels while at the same time addressing the skills mix of the future Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the Secretary of Defense enjoys similar authority which H.R. 1723 seeks to authorize for the DCI. At present, civilian employees at the National Security Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency are entitled to separation bonuses if the Secretary of Defense designates their occupational skill category as excess to the needs of the Defense Department. H.R. 1723 would establish a degree of uniformity within the U.S. intelligence community with regard to personnel reductions and future work force composition.

In addition, the Director of CIA is urged very strongly to ensure that minorities and women get the proper opportunities in this new, future intelligence structure.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I again would like to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], particularly for his efforts in holding hearings and doing the necessary work to develop the record. He and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] were responsible for getting the material so quickly to the House floor which the Director of Central Intelligence says was so important for their agency.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1723 which authorizes the Direc-

tor of Central Intelligence to offer separation incentives to designated Central Intelligence Agency employees who resign or retire voluntarily.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the end of the cold war, fewer U.S. resources are being dedicated to national security agencies.

To correspond to this fiscal reality, the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1993 directed the Central Intelligence Agency to reduce its personnel levels by 17.5 percent by the end of fiscal year 1997. Initially, Central Intelligence Agency managers believed they could achieve the mandated reductions through attrition alone. However, attrition rates have fallen significantly from the levels experienced just 1 year ago, and while the Central Intelligence Agency still expects to meet their fiscal year 1993 reduction targets through attrition, it will be at the expense of new hires. Mr. Speaker, in an ever-changing and unpredictable world, our intelligence agencies must have the flexibility to hire, although at a substantially reduced rate, new individuals, who with current Central Intelligence Agency employees, will provide the Central Intelligence Agency the necessary skills mix to perform its mission well into the future. H.R. 1723 will give the Central Intelligence Agency an important management tool to meet this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1723 will also save the American taxpayers' dollars. The amount of separation bonuses to be paid out will be more than offset by the savings realized by not having to pay future salaries and benefits. Moreover, additional savings will be realized in later years through reduced annuity payments brought about by voluntary early retirements.

Finally, H.R. 1723 is closely modeled on legislation enacted last year which authorized the Secretary of Defense to offer separation pay incentives to Department of Defense civilian employees. Thus, H.R. 1723 would put CIA employees on par with their counterparts at the National Security Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and other elements of the Nation's intelligence community within DOD who are eligible to receive this benefit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1723 provides the Director of Central Intelligence a humane and cost-saving measure to facilitate the congressionally mandated 17.5-percent personnel reduction. CIA employees often live undercover and place their personal safety second to the mission of the Agency. H.R. 1723 is an excellent expression of gratitude to those CIA employees who now find their skills and services no longer needed by the Agency but who tirelessly dedicated their lives to ensuring the security of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Intelligence Committee for bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1723, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the establishment of a program under which employees of the Central Intelligence Agency may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1723, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

JERRY L. LITTON UNITED STATES POST OFFICE BUILDING

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1779) to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 401 South Washington Street in Chillicothe, MO, as the "Jerry L. Litton United States Post Office Building."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1779

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 South Washington Street in Chillicothe, Missouri, is designated as the "Jerry L. Litton United States Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS].

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 1779, which will designate the U.S. Post Office in Chillicothe, MO, the "Jerry L. Litton United States Post Office."

Mr. Litton was elected to Congress on November 7, 1972 and was considered one of the most active Members elected that year and served as a distinguished member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Litton won reelection to the House in 1974 and became chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and the Full Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Litton was well respected by many of his colleagues as was indicated by numerous favorable remarks made by Members of this House upon his untimely death in 1976.

I am pleased to join Congresswoman DANNER, and the citizens of Chillicothe, MO, in their desire to name the postal facility in Chillicothe, MO the "Jerry L. Litton United States Post Office," and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1779.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over the years as the use of the airplane has grown and become such an integral part of our daily lives the number of our colleagues who have lost their lives in airplane crashes have grown as well. One of those crashes, on August 3, 1976, took the life of our former colleague, Congressman Jerry Litton of Missouri.

Elected to this body in 1972, he was an active member of the House Agriculture Committee. As a youth he had served as the Missouri State Future Farmers of America president and had a lifelong interest in the raising of Charolais cattle. His death was made more tragic because he had just won the Missouri Democratic Primary for a seat in the U.S. Senate and was beginning a flight to a victory party in another part of the State when his airplane, with family and supporters on board crashed upon take-off from the Chillicothe Airport.

I would be remiss if I did not express the appreciation of the minority to one of Congressman Litton's successor's in the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri, for her introduction of H.R. 1779 and giving us the opportunity of honoring his memory in this fashion.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER).

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise today in support of H.R. 1779, a bill which will recognize the enduring legacy of a former Member of this body, the late Congressman from the 6th District of Missouri, Jerry Litton.

There is a phrase: "Gone but not forgotten." The late Congressman Jerry Litton is gone from this body but he has not been forgotten by the colleagues here today with whom he served.

Jerry Litton was born in Lock Springs, MO. He received his early education there and in Chillicothe, MO. Even in those early days, the trademark Litton work ethic was evident.

As a high school student, he farmed land that he leased, and, in addition, he worked as an announcer at a local radio station. By the time he graduated from high school, he had saved nearly \$15,000.

Jerry attended the University of Missouri where he majored in agriculture journalism and economics. Upon graduating from the university, he devoted full time to the Litton ranch and quickly became a nationally recognized expert on the subject of bovine genetics. The Litton name became synonymous with that of pure bred Charolais. In addition, he served the ranchers of north Missouri, the United States, and the world by publishing a magazine devoted to perfecting the art and science of bovine breeding.

Jerry traced his political interest to a 1957 meeting with President Harry Truman. The scheduled 15-minute meeting lasted 2 hours while they discussed the greatness of our country and the obstacles facing those in public service.

President Truman told Jerry that he could either become part of the political establishment or go into business and establish a nonpolitical relationship with the voters. Jerry took the President's advice and did just that—instituted a direct, relationship with the people of the sixth district as a businessman who understood the concerns and needs of the people of the district—because he was one of them.

His calling to public service came in 1972 when he and six other Democrats competed for Missouri's Sixth Congressional District seat.

He always said "I may not be smarter, I may not be as well known, but I know I can outwork any of them." In typical Litton fashion, he overwhelmed his opponents and, once in Congress, wasted no time making a name for himself.

He built a consensus between rural and urban residents when a nationwide beef boycott threatened to divide and injure both groups. With hard work and skillful negotiating, the boycott was averted. That was how Jerry Litton operated.

Perhaps Jerry Litton's most enduring legacy is the principle which states "that government governs best which governs closest to the people." Just 3 months into his first term, he began a series of public forums called "Dialogue With Litton" in which constituents were invited to come together and ask questions of their Congressman and outstanding guests such as the Secretary of Agriculture, every Democratic Primary Presidential candidate, as well as others who Jerry felt were too often only names on the evening news to his constituents. The forums were pure Litton: a close but tough discussion in which public officials responded to the concerns of the audience.

President Carter said that Jerry had, "with a great sensitivity, figured out a unique way . . . to stay close to folks back home." The forums were televised and became an overwhelming success. Again, Jerry Litton took government

to the people and the people responded. Commenting on Jerry's extraordinary efforts as a freshman, former Speaker Tip O'Neill said that he'd "been in Congress 22 years and never yet met a freshman Member that could equal Jerry Litton."

In 1974, Jerry won reelection by a record 79 percent of the vote. Following that election, he was made chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Forests.

Jerry Litton entered the 1976 Democrat primary for U.S. Senate against three better known and more experienced opponents. In typical fashion, he campaigned tirelessly, often outrunning and outlasting his staff, knowing that if nothing else, he could outwork the competition.

On primary night, August 3, 1976, the returns showed Jerry had won the primary with 53 percent of the vote. From his home in Chillicothe, Jerry, his wife and their two children boarded a plane for a flight to Kansas City for the victory celebration. The small plane crashed just outside of his hometown, ending the lives of all aboard.

Mr. Speaker, that might Missouri and our Nation lost one of our truly bright stars. He was a man who, President Carter said "had a good chance to be President of the United States."

As his district assistant, I saw first hand the relationship between Jerry and the people of the sixth district. I saw the way he listened to them and the way they responded to him. He told them the truth and never forgot who his real employers were. He often spoke of the need for people to have real faith; "... our country" he said, "cannot function when its people have lost faith; be it faith in God, faith in their country, faith in their leaders, or faith in its system."

He believed in his heart and said often to those he touched "I have faith in God, in myself, in my country, in our democracy and in our systems. And if enough of us do, we'll make America not what it is but what it ought to be and what we know it can be."

On the granite memorial that stands in Jerry Litton's honor are the words "Happy are those who dream dreams and are ready to pay the price to make them come true." Jerry Litton was a dreamer of dreams. Those of us who knew and worked with him could fill volumes with what he was like and what his dreams meant to each of us. But, his true legacy is with the people of the sixth district. There are so many people who say "Yes, I knew Jerry Litton. I'll never forget him. He was a good friend of mine."

It is in this spirit that I urge passage of H.R. 1779, a bill to honor the late Congressman from Missouri's Sixth District, Jerry L. Litton.

□ 1550

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for

time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1779.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABE MURDOCK UNITED STATES POST OFFICE BUILDING

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 588) to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 20 South Main in Beaver, UT, as the "Abe Murdock United States Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 588

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 South Main in Beaver, Utah, is designated as the "Abe Murdock United States Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 is deemed to be a reference to the "Abe Murdock United States Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS].

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Abe Murdock was elected to serve as the attorney for Beaver County, UT in 1923. He also served four terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. In 1941, he won a seat in the U.S. Senate, where he was active in assisting the State of Utah in becoming one of the leading States in the West.

The passage of H.R. 588, would allow for the Beaver County, UT, community to come together on July 18, 1993, and honor the memory of their distinguished citizen, by officially designating and prominently marking the Beaver County Federal building—on the 100th anniversary of the Senator's birth, "The Abe Murdock Federal Building."

I am pleased to join Congressman HANSEN, primary sponsor of H.R. 588, along with the Murdock family and friends, in their desire to name the

postal facility at 20 South Main Street, Beaver, UT, in honor of Abe Murdock and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 588.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of the citizens of Beaver, UT, and their loyal efforts to rename the Beaver post office after a former Representative and Senator, the late Abe Murdock. H.R. 588 will designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service in Beaver, UT, as the "Abe Murdock United States Post Office Building." I also thank my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for their efforts to quickly bring this legislation to the floor.

This is the second time the House has acted on this legislation. Last session, we unanimously passed H.R. 4786 and sent the bill to the Senate. Unfortunately, the text of an unrelated bill was attached to the Murdock measure and the House would not agree to the language. Consequently, the 102d session came to an end without officially renaming the post office after Abe Murdock.

The Beaver citizens are anxiously waiting to plan a July celebration to commemorate Abe Murdock's 100th birthday. Since the Beaver post office was erected during Mr. Murdock's term in Congress, this event seems very appropriate. With this in mind, it is my hope that we can place our final stamp of approval on H.R. 588.

Abe Murdock was born on July 18, 1893 to parents whose roots were deeply embedded in the settlement of southern Utah. In the early 1800's his grandfather, Mr. John R. Murdock, was selected by state leaders to establish the town of Beaver, UT. His own parents, Orrice Abram Murdock and Lucinda Robinson were both advocates and leaders within the Beaver community as well. It is obvious that this strong family heritage taught Abe Murdock to believe in the West and stand by his principles.

Mr. Murdock built his life on public service. After studying law at the University of Utah, he lived in Beaver, UT, and served as the Beaver County attorney. In 1932, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and fought to establish and maintain Utah's water rights. He served four terms in the House and in 1940, he was elected to the U.S. Senate. Throughout his political career, he supported Utah by protecting grazing rights and ensuring the conservation of both water and soil. To the best of my knowledge, he is the only person in the history of Utah politics to successfully win a seat in both the House and the Senate.

He was an active supporter of labor law and believed in the working man. His work was recognized in 1948 when

President Harry S. Truman appointed him to the National Labor Relations Board. He served two consecutive 5-year terms. Later, he was appointed to a Presidential panel which addressed labor-management relations in the atomic energy industry. His advocacy and leadership planted many of the seeds which spurred Utah's success as a leading State in the West.

It is obvious that this fine man, a good Democrat, I might add, deserves this special recognition. I urge my colleagues to support final passage of H.R. 588 and permit the citizens of Beaver to pay homage to their friend and community leader. I am honored to offer this bill and thank the House for placing Abe Murdock's name on the Beaver, UT, post office.

□ 1600

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 588.

The question was taken.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bills, H.R. 588 and H.R. 1779.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1159, PASSENGER VESSEL SAFETY ACT OF 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 172 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 172

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of

the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. GOSS, pending which, I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 172 is an open rule which provides for the consideration of H.R. 1159, the Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993.

This open rule provides 1 hour of general debate and will allow for any Member who has a germane amendment to offer his or her amendment to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1159 is a bill which will close a loophole in the maritime safety laws that currently allows bareboat charterers to escape Coast Guard safety inspections of their vessels.

This legislation reclassifies the terms, small passenger and passenger vessel, and requires that these vessels meet the minimum Coast Guard requirements for safety.

I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. TAUZIN, and the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. STUDDS, for bringing this bill to the floor in such a timely fashion.

While this is noncontroversial legislation, the closing of this loophole in the maritime laws will allow the Coast Guard to better insure the safety of bare boat charterers and their passengers.

Again, I would like to state that this is an open rule which allows for the of-

fering of any germane amendment to the bill and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding and wish to tell him how pleased we are on this side to have this open rule, as I am sure he understands.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there have been some who have asked me if there might be a new dawn breaking in the House. Today we have another open rule and one that really is truly 100 percent pure, no restrictions, no waivers, no strings, no magic, no tricks.

Clean and simple, I guess is the way to say it, and that is that way it used to be most of the time, and I think most of us hope that that is the way it should be most of the time.

The legislation, the Passenger Vessel Safety Act, is a bill that is very important, obviously, to anybody who has charter boats, whether it be from the private owners perspective, the public user, public safety agencies or others involved.

There is no doubt that that is important, and we should be very clear that this bill could nevertheless, as important as it is, it is equally non-controversial, I understand, and probably could come forward under suspension of the rules. And I suspect that in this very extraordinary year when we have so much incredibly challenging legislation in front of us, it would not really qualify as the type of major legislation that was promised to us under open rule by the Speaker of the House.

Of course, I do not wish in any way to diminish the very hard work of my colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, a committee which I hold in the very highest regard and personal interest. I am a former graduate of that particular committee, and I appreciate the work that they have done on this.

Still, I am very delighted to support the open rule because, despite the merits most of us see in this bill, in fact that there are some questions about it and there are some who feel that it will have some effect on the small charter business. In fact, I have been advised there are some parties who are involved who believe they will be negatively impacted by this legislation.

Those are precisely the people for whom an open rule is designated, to allow Members to fully air any and all concerns that have been raised and any Member who wishes to become an advocate of those concerns, to clarify or to challenge a point in this legislation, may do under an open rule.

That is the way democracy was envisaged to work.

So let us hope that this open rule is not a false dawn. We are certainly

going to need plenty of daylight for the others tasks that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and in the spirit of bipartisan support, this side will not call for a vote on this open rule for which we are so thankful.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair will announce that this will be a 15-minute vote to be followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 308, nays 0, not voting 124, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—308

Ackerman	Coleman	Gallo
Allard	Collins (GA)	Gekas
Andrews (ME)	Collins (IL)	Gephardt
Andrews (NJ)	Collins (MI)	Gibbons
Andrews (TX)	Combest	Gillmor
Archer	Condit	Gilman
Bacchus (FL)	Costello	Glickman
Bacchus (AL)	Cramer	Goode
Baessler	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Baker (CA)	Danner	Goodling
Barcia	Darden	Gordon
Barlow	de la Garza	Goss
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Grams
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Green
Bateman	Dellums	Greenwood
Becerra	Derrick	Hall (OH)
Bellenson	Deutsch	Hall (TX)
Bentley	Diaz-Balart	Hamburger
Bereuter	Dickey	Hamilton
Bevill	Dingell	Hancock
Bilirakis	Dixon	Hansen
Blackwell	Dornan	Harman
Bliley	Dreier	Hastert
Blute	Duncan	Herger
Boehlert	Dunn	Hinchey
Bonilla	Durbin	Hoagland
Bonior	Edwards (CA)	Hobson
Brooks	Emerson	Hoekstra
Brown (CA)	English (AZ)	Horn
Brown (OH)	English (OK)	Houghton
Bryant	Eshoo	Hoyer
Bunning	Evans	Huffington
Burton	Everett	Hughes
Buyer	Fawell	Hunter
Byrne	Fazio	Hutchinson
Callahan	Fields (LA)	Hyde
Camp	Fields (TX)	Inlee
Canady	Filner	Istook
Cantwell	Fingerhut	Jacobs
Castle	Fish	Jefferson
Clay	Ford (MI)	Johnson (CT)
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Johnson (GA)
Clinger	Franks (CT)	Johnson (SD)
Clyburn	Franks (NJ)	Johnson, E.B.
Coble	Furse	Kanjorski

Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Klecza
Klein
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McMillan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Mollinari
Mollohan

Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott

Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Swett
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmers
Walker
Walsh
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—124

Abercrombie
Applegate
Armedy
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehner
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clement
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
DeFazio
DeLay
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Edwards (TX)

Engel
Ewing
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Gallegly
Geldenson
Geren
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Grandy
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kennedy
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Leach

Lehman
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Maloney
Margolies
Mezinsky
Matsui
McCollum
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Mineta
Minge
Murphy
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Payne (VA)
Quillen
Rahall
Ridge
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpallius
Schaefer
Schroeder

Shaw
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Stokes
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift

Talent
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Torricelli
Vucanovich
Washington

□ 1638

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABE MURDOCK UNITED STATES POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 588.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 588, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 306, nays 3, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—306

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Billakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combust
Condit
Costello

Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gillman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green

Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Klecza
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)

Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McMillan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Orton

Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky

Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Swett
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmers
Walker
Walsh
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Huffington Penny Pombo

NOT VOTING—123

Abercrombie
Applegate
Armedy
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehner
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clement
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
DeFazio
DeLay
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Edwards (TX)

Frost
Gallegly
Geldenson
Geren
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Grandy
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kennedy
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Leach
Lehman
Linder
Lipinski
Maloney
Margolies
Mezinsky
Matsui
McCurdy
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty

Meehan
Mineta
Murphy
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Payne (VA)
Quillen
Rahall
Ridge
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpallius
Schaefer
Schroeder
Shaw
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Stokes
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Torricelli
Vucanovich
Washington
Waters

Williams Woolsey Zeliff
Wise Young (AK) Zimmer

□ 1647

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I wish to have the RECORD show that I was unable to be present for votes on rollcall Nos. 176 and 177. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on both votes.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was detained and missed rollcall votes 176 and 177 on May 24, 1993. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each noncontroversial bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 24, 1993, I was unavoidably absent from the House Chamber during rollcall vote No. 176 and rollcall vote No. 177. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" in both cases.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes 176 and 177 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall votes No. 176 and 177.

Had I been present on the House floor during those votes, on rollcall vote No. 176, I would have voted "yea" to revise, clarify, and improve marine safety laws.

Finally, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote no. 177, to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service at 20 South Maine in Beaver, UT, as the "Abe Murdock United States Post Office Building."

PASSENGER VESSEL SAFETY ACT
OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bills, H.R. 1159.

□ 1648

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mrs. CLAYTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1650

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1159, the Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993, will help protect the lives of thousands of Americans who charter boats. The bill closes a loophole in our safety laws which allows some boatowners to charter their vessels to large groups of people without complying with Coast Guard safety regulations.

Under current law, a boatowner can escape Coast Guard passenger vessel safety regulations by bareboat chartering the vessel. A bareboat charter is similar to renting a car, because the charterer rents only the vessel—the bare boat—and is responsible for its operation. Charterers often assume that the vessel is Coast Guard inspected and operated by a licensed individual. Unfortunately, this assumption is usually wrong.

H.R. 1159 closes this loophole by restricting recreational bareboat charters to 12 or fewer passengers. This will allow families and groups of friends to bareboat charter recreational vessels for vacations, but treats larger, commercial charters as passenger vessels and thus subject to Coast Guard inspection.

Some bareboat charter operators have argued that this legislation will put them out of business. We have given this group every opportunity to meet and develop an alternative that is acceptable to the Coast Guard and meets minimal safety standards. However, no proposal has surfaced because the bareboat charterers insist they are recreational vessel owners.

Let me assure Members that the Passenger Vessel Safety Act will not put any legitimate passenger vessel owner out of business. It does not make bareboat charters illegal. It does force those who so charter their vessels to meet Coast Guard safety standards. The bareboat industry is given until May 1, 1994, to upgrade its vessels.

This is a good bill. It is supported by the Passenger Vessel Association, the National Association of Charterboat Operators, the Boat Owners Association of the United States, the National

Marine Manufacturers Association, and the U.S. Coast Guard. I urge all Members to support it.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I rise in support of H.R. 1159, the Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993.

While this may not be a perfect bill, it is an important step forward for safety on the water and I would like to compliment our colleagues, BILLY TAUZIN and HOWARD COBLE, for their leadership in crafting this proposal. This bill is the product of nearly 2 years of careful consideration and it will close a dangerous loophole in our Coast Guard inspection laws.

Madam Chairman, the Coast Guard estimates that there are between 500 and 700 vessel operators using something called a bareboat charter arrangement to carry passengers without having to meet Coast Guard safety standards. Under this arrangement, the owner of a vessel enters into a contract with a person or group of individuals whereby they take possession of his ship for a specific period of time.

By so doing, this bareboat charter is able to avoid all Coast Guard safety laws because these vessels are now considered recreational in nature.

Regrettably, this type of business practice allows individuals to operate vessels that are potentially unsafe and it subjects unsuspecting members of the public to serious injury or death. This bill closes the loopholes in existing law and it brings all vessels that are engaged in the business of carrying passengers under the present safety scheme.

I know that some Members are concerned that requiring the owners of these vessels to comply with Coast Guard safety standards may put some safe operators out of business. The intent of this legislation is not to put safe vessel owners out of business. The Coast Guard safety standards for passenger vessels are flexible enough to allow truly safe vessel operations to continue, while stopping unsafe or marginally safe vessel operators from carrying large groups of people aboard their vessels. There is a phase-in period of nearly 1 year for the requirements under this bill, with an additional year available at the discretion of the Coast Guard.

Finally, this bill will still allow recreational bareboat charters to continue in the future. H.R. 1159 allows friends and families in groups of 12 or fewer to charter a vessel for a holiday without having to undergo a Coast Guard inspection.

Madam Chairman, this bill has been proposed by both the Bush and Clinton

administrations. I would urge my colleagues to vote aye on this important legislation. We must not wait for tragedies to occur before mandating these most basic safety requirements.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUDDS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Chairman, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 1159, the Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993. I would first like to thank the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Honorable GERRY STUDDS of Massachusetts, for his support, and also our ranking minority member, Congressman JACK FIELDS of Texas, and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HOWARD COBLE, our subcommittee ranking minority member, for their cooperation. This has been a truly bipartisan effort, which, Madam Chairman, is typical of the work of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

This bill is the product of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, which I chair. It has not been without controversy in our committee. It is the result of a great deal of effort on the part of our members, their staffs, and the Coast Guard. We have spent many hours negotiating with groups and organizations affected by this legislation and I am proud that these efforts have produced what I believe is a bill that may save lives in the future.

Madam Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to bring recreational vessels which may carry large numbers of paying passengers into the Coast Guard's vessel safety inspection program. There are a growing number of vessels that are being chartered out under what is called a bareboat charter agreement. A bareboat charter is a legal arrangement whereby the boatowner charters his vessel to a person who assumes all legal liability and responsibility for the vessel during the term of the charter. Under these types of arrangements, each passenger is required to sign the bareboat charter agreement upon boarding the vessel. Many of these passengers are not even aware that they are signing such a transfer of liability. These vessels can carry large numbers of people but are not required by current law to be inspected by the Coast Guard. The current trend in these operations is to charter for less than 1 day to up to 200 people for parties, weddings, receptions, and the like. These vessels are documented as recreational vessels and are only subject to recreational vessel safety standards.

H.R. 1159 will impose additional safety requirements on bareboat charters

carrying more than 12 passengers or over 100 gross tons. Those carrying over 12 passengers will be required to upgrade their vessels and provide additional firefighting and lifesaving equipment. They may also be subject to standards for hull construction, stability, manning, electrical wiring, and machinery installation. The bill gives these vessels until May 1, 1994, to come into compliance, but gives the Coast Guard the discretion to allow vessels up to 1 additional year to comply where the vessel owner has made a good faith effort.

Many of those who are entering into these charter arrangements are unaware that these vessels are not required to meet safety standards required of other types of passenger vessels. Coast Guard safety standards vary according to the type of vessel, with recreational vessels having the least stringent, and inspected passenger vessels having the most stringent. These bareboat charters have made the argument that they are recreational vessels and should be subject only to recreational vessel standards which are very minimal. In opposing this bill, they have argued that the bill will put them out of business.

The Coast Guard has brought to our attention some of the cases which illustrate the need for this legislation. In one case in California, a vessel was chartered to 120 high school students and their chaperones for a post-graduation party. The hours of the party were to be from 10:30 p.m. to 3 a.m. As each student and the chaperones boarded the vessel, they were required to sign a document. There was one short sentence on the document which indicated that it was a bareboat charter agreement. The terms of the agreement were not attached. One of the parents who acted as a chaperone later told the Coast Guard that he had no idea what he was signing and would not have signed had he known the liability he was assuming. The Coast Guard boarded the vessel and cited the owner for operating the vessel without a certificate of inspection, employing an unlicensed individual to operate the vessel, and using the vessel in a trade other than that for which it was documented. The Coast Guard fined the owner \$3,000 and found that it was not a valid bareboat charter. The difficulty in these cases is that the Coast Guard must challenge the validity of each of these bareboat charters in order to impose any of these safety standards. These teenagers and their parents had no idea that those kids became the owner of that vessel for that limited time, became liable for the vessel, and that the vessel was not Coast Guard inspected. They had no idea that their children were on a vessel operated by an unlicensed individual on a voyage in the Pacific Ocean in the middle of the night. Hopefully, this bill will stop this

type of practice and the dangers it poses.

The bill will provide a means by which the passengers, who pay hard-earned money for a safe and pleasant day on our waters, can be assured that they will not be placing themselves, their families, and friends on board an unsafe, uninspected vessel in the hands of an unlicensed master. Many of our vessel safety laws are the result of catastrophic accidents with the loss of many lives. I urge my colleagues not to wait for a serious accident before we take further action. I urge that Members join me in supporting this important safety measure.

□ 1700

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUZIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chairman, in my district there are private vessel owners who on occasion allow their vessels to be used for charitable events. According to the Coast Guard, persons who purchase tickets for a charitable event on a vessel would be considered passengers for hire, and thus subject the vessel to the passenger vessel safety rules. It is my understanding that H.R. 1159 authorizes the Coast Guard to grant excursion permits for specific outings such as this, where the Coast Guard may waive inspection requirements for a specific vessel to take a specific voyage.

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Chairman, under this bill, the committee intends that the Coast Guard would grant voyage-by-voyage excursion permits under the authority of 46 U.S.C. 2113 for vessels donated to charities for fund-raising events. However, to avoid abuse and exploitation of the process, the Coast Guard should require the following:

First, the charity would have to be a bona fide charity along the lines of a nonprofit organization qualified under 28 U.S.C. 501(c)(3);

Second, all funds received must go to the named charity;

Third, the vessel could only be used as a charitable excursion vessel by individual charities on an occasional basis;

Fourth, the charity would be required to apply to the local marine inspection office for an excursion permit for each voyage; and

Fifth, that a permit shall be issued if the Coast Guard is satisfied that the vessel will be safe for its use and route.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the great gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] and I yield him this time because he is filled with such knowledge that I cannot really put a specific time limit on the time he might consume.

Mr. COBLE. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is embellishing this matter a bit, and I thank him for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 1159, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993.

As the ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, I have had the opportunity to help in the development of this legislation from the beginning. Our subcommittee and full committee amended the original Coast Guard proposal several times in order to balance our interest in increased maritime safety with the concerns of the vessel owners and operators whose livelihoods depend on the carriage of passengers.

I agree with the Coast Guard's assessment that the surge of recreational vessels carrying hundreds of passengers in our Nation's waterways, with little or no Coast Guard safety oversight, is an accident or a disaster waiting to happen. Every American who boards a commercial vessel, whether it be for an extended vacation or a dinner cruise, should be assured that his or her safety will be protected.

Some critics of this legislation contend that this bill is merely another attempt by Government to overregulate our lives and a way to destroy a growing industry. Anyone who examines my 8 years in Congress will quickly observe that I have opposed efforts to overregulate our Nation. I would be the first to vote against a bill which required recreational boaters to become subject to unnecessary and expensive inspections. However, I strongly believe that Congress has the responsibility to provide the public with an acceptable level of safety when they board commercial vessels.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation which will allow the Coast Guard to bring all commercial vessels into compliance with our Nation's commercial vessel standards.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Madam Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out to the committee that this is one more example of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee working together in a bipartisan fashion addressing concerns that some Members had early on, and coming forward with a piece of legislation that should be acceptable to everyone, particularly when we think about the delicate nature of the subject matter. I, too, want to compliment Chairman STUDDS and Chairman TAUZIN and my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COBLE.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUDDS. Madam Chairman, I just hear the sound of bipartisan harmony and lifesaving at the same time. I commend all of the Members.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1159, the Passenger Vessel Safety Regulations Act. I believe this is a balanced bill which attempts to protect public safety, and preserve opportunity for the men and women who engage in charter operations.

This legislation will help instill confidence in the boating public that the vessels they charter are seaworthy and meet the standards promoted by the U.S. Coast Guard. This bill will provide clearer definitions of what constitutes a passenger for hire, and a better understanding of what kind of safety features are needed on vessels carrying multiple passengers. Currently, there is no guarantee that the passengers for hire who charter two different vessels at different times will receive crafts of comparable safety standards.

I believe it is in the interest of the boating public and the charter industry to provide consistent regulation of this industry, and to clarify what the rules are and to whom they apply.

I would like to commend Chairman TAUZIN and his staff for their hard work and determined effort to let all interested parties in this legislation have their day in court. This bill is also a testament to the U.S. Coast Guard which has spent considerable time reaching out to businesses and people potentially affected by this legislation. Finally, H.R. 1159 represents the best alternative for all parties and will once and for all end the confusion which has frustrated owners and passengers alike. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STUDDS. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. STUDDS. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CANTWELL] having assumed the chair, Mrs. CLAYTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1159) to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the

Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Thursday, May 20, 1993 at 5:40 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits the annual report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 1992 and the Inventory of Federal Funds Distributed to Public Telecommunications Entities by Federal Departments and Agencies: Fiscal Year 1992.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,

Clerk.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING AND INVENTORY OF FEDERAL FUNDS DISTRIBUTED TO PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENTITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 1992 and the Inventory of the Federal Funds Distributed to Public Telecommunications Entities by Federal Departments and Agencies: Fiscal Year 1992.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 20, 1993.

□ 1710

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT'S 1994 BUDGET REQUEST AND 1993 BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mrs. CLAYTON] laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia government's 1994 budget request and 1993 budget supplemental request.

The District of Columbia government has submitted a 1994 budget request for \$3,389 million in 1994 that includes a Federal payment of \$671.5 million, the amount authorized and requested by the Mayor and City Council. The Presi-

dent's recommended 1994 Federal payment level of \$653 million is also included in the District's 1994 budget as an alternative level. My transmittal of the District's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

I look forward to working with the Congress throughout the 1994 appropriation process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 24, 1993.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 60-minute special orders heretofore granted for today to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] be interchanged in their order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

OPEN RULES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, somebody recently said that, "What are they afraid of? Why are they afraid of the people participating in the democratic process? Why do they not let us vote? Do not be afraid of democracy."

Some of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle might very well assume that this passionate statement came from a member of the minority, someone like me or any of my colleagues on this side who have become frustrated by being repeatedly and shamelessly shut out of the democratic process by restrictive rules in this House. After all, this Congress has seen the greatest percent of restrictive rules on major pieces of legislation in recent memory, so much so that well-respected publications in this country have seen the need to comment on it either by columnists or on their editorial pages.

The Wall Street Journal, on May 21 on its editorial page, referred to this Congress as "the kangaroo Congress," and made particular note that moderate House Democrats certainly as well as the minority party are not given a chance for an up-or-down vote for replacing the energy tax with entitlement caps. They say, "These folks are steaming." I think they may have it right.

In the Washington Post, George Will on May 23 made a very, I think, profound observation when he said:

This year in the House, more than ever before, members of the minority and Democrats dissenting from liberal orthodoxy are being prevented from offering amendments

to major bills. They are prevented by the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee, which adopts restrictive or even closed rules rather than the open rules of particular bills heading for the floor.

Mr. Will then goes on to characterize this as a gagging procedure.

I think it might be a good assumption that those words about letting the people participate in democracy that I started with would have come from a member of the minority, but, in fact, that assumption would be wrong. That statement was actually made by a gentleman of tremendous power in this town, in this Congress, a member of the Democrat leadership with nearly absolute control over just how open and democratic this Congress really is; as if to refute his party's tendency to shut down debate and restrict votes, that member of the Democratic leadership made a fervent plea for openness to all America. The speaker to whom I am referring is the majority leader of the other body, the gentleman from Maine, Mr. MITCHELL. He made his comments elsewhere, but they hold equally true in this House.

Madam Speaker, as we approach this massive tax increase bill proposed by the President fashioned behind closed doors by Democrat leaders of the Committee on Ways and Means and scheduled to be brought to this floor later in the week, I hope Mr. MITCHELL's Democrat colleagues in the House leadership will heed his words.

Madam Speaker, I implore them, as he has, do not be afraid of democracy. Why not open up the process and let all 435 Members of this House participate fully in crafting this very critical money bill? This legislation will affect every American family, every worker, every senior citizen, and it will determine the course of our Nation's economy in the coming years.

This bill deals with issues of taxation and spending, of economic security and productivity, issues that require the careful consideration and attention of every Member of this House.

To allow this bill, which has largely been pieced together by a handful of all-powerful members of the Democrat leadership in secret, without public scrutiny, to proceed to the floor without adequate opportunity for all Members to make improvements is to short-change millions of Americans from their right to have equal representation in this body, the people's House. Quite simply, it would be wrong, and I predict that it would yield less than the best legislation if we do not open debate.

Madam Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the reconciliation bill that incorporates the very strong message I have received from my constituents, and that message is simply: "Do not raise taxes. Cut spending first."

My amendment offers the exact amount of spending cuts, \$104 billion

over 5 years, that are needed to offset the projected revenues from the proposed energy and Social Security taxes. If my amendment were adopted, we could do away with these two unfair taxes. They are inflationary, they are punitive, and instead we could take a small step toward fiscal sanity and restoring credibility of this institution by cutting unnecessary Federal spending.

There is no magic in my list of cuts. It includes programs that affect my State as well as the rest of the Nation. It is a portion of a list that I have made available to the President and to the Committee on the Budget several months ago. It has been largely ignored despite the very real savings it would realize, about \$200 billion over 5 years.

I know that others have similar amendments, and they will seek to offer them. I urge the Democrat leadership to acknowledge the importance of an open process and allow these amendments to come to the floor.

If Members do not like my list of cuts, I hope that they will offer a list of their own. There are certainly plenty of wasteful, redundant, low-priority, or no-priority programs to choose from.

The Democrat-controlled Committee on Rules which has authority to determine whether the full House will get a chance to vote on my amendment or any others that will be proposed will likely be meeting this Wednesday. Because of the significance of these issues, I hope all Americans will be paying attention and will make themselves heard as appropriate.

Madam Speaker, what is there to be afraid of? In my view, nothing, as long as we stick to open rules and fair play.

Madam Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD the proposed list of cuts, as follows:

SPENDING CUTS TO OFFSET BTU AND SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES—SAVINGS ARE IN MILLIONS OVER 5 YEARS

Cancel the National Aerospace Plane (NASP)—\$650.

Continue partial civilian hiring freeze for D.O.D. thru 1997—\$8,850.

Cancel NASA's advanced solid rocket motor—\$1,650.

Cancel the superconducting supercollider—\$2,300.

Cut space station funding by 15%—\$1,560.

Eliminate below-cost timber sales from national forests—\$230.

Lower target prices for subsidized crops by 3% annually—\$11,200.

Eliminate price support for wool and mohair—\$760.

Eliminate the Honey Program—\$60.

Eliminate the Market Promotion Program—\$900.

End the Federal Crop Insurance Program and replace with standing authority for disaster assistance—\$2,400.

Reduce subsidies to the Rural Electrification Administration—\$660.

Phase out the Foreign Agricultural Service Cooperation funding—\$70.

Eliminate the Appalachian Regional Commission—\$530.

50% of the arts and humanities—\$2,600.

Facilitate contracting out and privatization of military commissaries—\$4,200.

Close the Interstate Commerce Commission—\$145.

End funding for all non-energy related Tennessee Valley Authority activities—\$580.

Lower by 3% per year the projected growth rate of all non-Postal Service civilian agency overhead costs—excluding travel—\$18,350 (The Heritage Foundation).

Eliminate all funding for highway demonstration projects—\$5,200 (The Heritage Foundation).

Sell the National Helium Reserves—\$700 (The Heritage Foundation).

Phase out subsidies for AMTRAK, and sell the northeast corridor to the private sector—\$2,660 (The Heritage Foundation).

Cut the foreign aid budget (150 account) by 15%—\$11,000 (in-house calculation).

Fully implement H.R. 1080 to prohibit direct Federal benefits and unemployment benefits to illegal aliens—\$27,000 (National taxpayers Union).

Total five year savings: \$104.91 billion.

□ 1720

SUPPORT FOR SPACE PROGRAM REMAINS STRONG, NATIONAL SURVEY SHOWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CLAYTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to share with the House the results of a new survey that was released today nationwide.

The survey was by Yankelovich Partners, one of the most reputable and prestigious of all polling firms in this country. The survey was a survey of American attitudes toward the space program, which, as we, all know, is in some jeopardy in this body.

I would like to share, Madam Speaker, with my colleagues the consequences of our ignoring the true will of the American people.

The true will of the American people is that we support the space program, and the survey bears that out.

Let me quote:

Despite changes in presidential Administrations, a new political agenda and increased attention to deficit reduction, a large majority of Americans continue to strongly support the U.S. civilian space program, with a majority saying it should be expanded.

Support was particularly strong for maintaining a human presence in space through such programs as the space shuttle and space station, on which we will be voting in a few weeks, and 9 out of 10 voters said they view the shuttle as a "remarkable technological achievement" and a source of pride for the United States. In addition, 70 percent favored a program to build a permanently-manned space station to orbit Earth.

Seventy-six percent of those surveyed, and these were registered voters, said they "approve of America's

current civilian space program," with 57 percent agreeing that America's civilian space program should be expanded.

Moreover, 87 percent believe the civilian space program has a vital role in allowing the United States to remain economically competitive and continue its status as a world leader in technology.

Now, why do they feel this way? Americans viewed the possibility of making new and important scientific and medical discoveries as the program's most important benefit. Other benefits include keeping the Nation's young people interested and involved in studying science, math and engineering, and increasing the understanding of the Earth's weather, climate, and environment. In fact, 88 percent of registered voters surveyed noted the value of using space satellites as a means of monitoring the Earth's environment, something we are planning to do with the mission Plant Earth.

American support for U.S. space efforts increased in relation to the amount of information provided about the program. When informed that the U.S. space budget makes up only 1 percent of the Federal budget, more than half, 64 percent, of the voters said NASA's share would be increased to 1.5 percent. In addition, the number of voters who want the Government to spend whatever is necessary to maintain U.S. leadership in space held steady at last year's all-time high of 63 percent.

Madam Speaker, voters also voiced support for the space program based on an international perspective. They said the space program was an effective means of building relationships with other nations. Seventy-eight percent suggested that the United States conduct joint space missions with other countries.

Over the next few weeks we will be considering the future of the space program in this House. We will undoubtedly have one more battle over the fate of the space station. I hope that as we do, we will keep these survey results in mind. I hope we will remember, as obviously the American people remember, that for every dollar we invested in the space program, we generated \$7 in additional gross national product for the American people. I hope we will remember that although the past half century two-thirds of our productivity increases can be attributed to advances in technology, such as the space program. I hope we will remember that most of the new jobs that have been created in the past decade have been occasioned by investments in technologies such as the space program.

Certainly we must cut our budget. We are doing that. We need to cut more. We will be cutting. It is all in the President's economic plan. And we will be doing more.

But as we cut, we must not be shortsighted. We must not cut those things that increase the possibilities of economic growth in this country. We must create conditions that would be conducive to economic growth by reducing not only our budget deficit but also our investment deficit. That means the new direction that the President has been talking about, means shifting our resources toward those investments that will create a better future for America: children, education, transportation, other infrastructure and, above all, advanced technologies such as the space program.

TRAVELGATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, and now we have Travelgate. The news of the last few days indicates that seven career employees of the White House were summarily discharged and then some kind of report issued and then the FBI involved in an investigation; personal politics, Hollywood politics, possible nepotism, if you can stretch the rules of blood and consanguinity far enough. All kinds of shenanigans happening at the White House. And perhaps they are important, perhaps they are just trial. But the one item that stands out from all of the hullabaloo of the last weekend is that the Congress of the United States has no mechanism in place to look more closely at this situation.

What am I referring to, Madam Speaker? As we speak here on the floor at this very precise moment, there is no independent counsel apparatus operating here in Washington. If this had happened during the Bush administration, I tell you, Madam Speaker, there would have been 50 Members of the House, primarily from the opposition, of course, from the then-opponents of the President, the Democrats, who would have been lining up to sign a petition to have an independent counsel look at what was happening in the White House in this type of situation.

But here today those of us in the American public sector who are interested in determining what happened in this Travelgate situation, we cannot, at this moment, file a petition; Members of the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to bring about the Office of Independent Counsel to look at this situation with close scrutiny.

And so we have to wonder, what are these investigations that have been launched? What is the FBI doing in this situation at this moment? Should we not learn more about it?

When the independent counsel statute first was considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and then by the full commit-

tee, many of us were strenuously inclined to support that bill if we also included Members of Congress as possible targets of an independent counsel inquiry. And many of us would be willing to support independent counsel whether or not Members of Congress were listed as possible targets of an independent inquiry such as the type that independent counsel's office could conduct.

But in either case, this new situation, this Travelgate is a signal, a clarion call to the Congress to proceed with the consideration of the independent counsel bill at the closest possible moment and to allow the American people and Congress which represents it, too, itself, independently inquire as to the happenings at the White House.

Madam Speaker, I am convinced that with the new constrictions that will be placed on independent counsel, we would not have that kind of melodrama that is occurring in the Walsh special prosecutor's office; we would have, under our new bill, tight reins on what the independent counsel can or cannot do.

□ 1730

We would have an annual reporting system where independent counsel would have to report to the Congress as to the expenditures made, to the scope of inquiry, to the parameters of the entire maneuvers of the Office of Independent Counsel. If we were able to put those audits in and those restraints which this new bill contains and add to it the provision that Members of Congress shall not be exempt from investigations of themselves, then we would have a bill in front of the Congress which we can support, and perhaps the day will come when many of us will be signing a petition to have an independent counsel look into the affairs of Travelgate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON A BILL MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCDADE reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CLAYTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE LARGEST TAX INCREASE IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CLAYTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, unless common sense prevails, we will take up later this week the largest tax increase in the history of the human race. The tax bill will come with deficit reduction written on its cover, but spending at its heart.

The bill reflects quite well its sponsor, the President who ran as a new Democrat, promising to cut spending and lower taxes on the middle class, but the campaign is over now.

The President is proposing to increase taxes on the middle class while allowing spending for everything but our country's defense to proceed as if spending were not an issue.

Madam Speaker, it is the issue. It seems that a new Democrat is really just an old tax-and-spend Democrat. The President is asking us to vote on \$332 billion in tax increases, and that is just in the next 5 years. The tax drain on the economy under the President's plan will be even greater in future years because of the built-in increases due to inflation.

The tax increases are effective immediately, except for the rate increases which are retroactive to the 1st of January this year; but under the President's budget, there are zero net spending cuts in the first 2 years. That is correct, zero net spending cuts in the first 2 years of his budget.

Yes, there are promised spending cuts over the 5 years, in the third, fourth, and fifth years, but we have heard that so often before. That was the thesis of Gramm-Rudman, but the big spending cuts were never permitted by the Congress to take effect in the fourth and fifth years.

We heard it again under the 1990 Budget Agreement, but the big spending cuts were not permitted to take effect in the fourth and fifth years; but as if \$332 billion were not enough, press reports are that the President will ask for even more taxes, perhaps an even larger aggregate of taxes on the American people under his health care reform package.

Madam Speaker, in addition, in the wings are taxes to cover the President's proposal for taxpayer financed campaigns, political campaigns financed by the taxpayers of this country, and the taxes to pay for the rest of the President's campaign proposals his staff just has not had the time to draft yet, such as guaranteed college education and the tax increases to pay for the middle-class tax cuts the President now says he will try to do in the next 4 years.

The economy is clearly showing signs of nervousness over the President's

proposals. Interest rates are climbing. Companies are now postponing hiring new workers. Consumers are reconsidering new purchases and the housing market is in limbo.

Economists are quite clear where to lay the blame for this renewed weakness in the economy. They lay it squarely on the shoulders of President Clinton and his proposals.

As an American, I would much rather be here today supporting the President and I would do so if his proposals could expect to increase jobs and the standard of living for Americans, but I believe his massive tax increases will do just the opposite.

The American people need to know why Republicans will vote against his misguided economic initiatives. Our alternative, the Kasich budget which was voted down earlier this year by the House, has specific spending cuts that would cut the deficit by almost \$500 billion without any tax increases.

I would say to my Democrat colleagues, tell the President that you have already voted en bloc against these specific spending cuts because he still does not seem to realize that Republicans are not just naysayers, that we have a specific program to cut spending and cut the deficit.

He still says, "Show me specific spending cuts."

Tell him they are there and you voted against them.

The procedure by which this tax bill was deliberated in the Ways and Means Committee should also concern Americans who believe that this Congress with all of its new Members, the largest in memory, would be a reform Congress, a Congress that would open up to the people, yet over the unanimous objections of the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee, committee Democrats voted to exclude the public and the news media from the deliberations on the tax bill.

Not only did they do that, but they wrote the specifics in secret over 3 days where only Democrats were in the room. Then they came back to the committee and in only 45 minutes they permitted Republicans in closed session, not open to the public, to offer their amendments.

We had many, many improving amendments, but after offering six the gavel went down and we were prohibited from offering any more amendments, so that the bill was reported out of committee in only 45 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from Texas was referring to with respect to the state of the economy and how the projection of the new tax package is actually dampening an economy that showed signs of life on

its own at the beginning of the year, at the end of last year and the beginning of this year, and now is in danger again.

The President, I believe, is saying, and I would ask the gentleman to correct me if I am wrong, that this is precisely, because of the state of the economy, is precisely why he wants these tax increases. He thinks that, along with his jobs program and everything else, will stimulate the economy.

Is he now still pointing the finger at those who are delaying the tax increase as people who are hurting the economy?

The gentleman said, and I was glad to hear it, that the economists themselves are saying that the fear of the tax increases, the trepidation that is being caused at the new spending proposals is causing business cycles to hold back, is holding the consumer from spending, those kinds of things.

The economists then are countering that.

What is the President saying in that regard that I am missing, I would ask the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ARCHER. Well, Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is precisely correct. The President seems to be trying to convince the American people that massive tax increases will improve the economy, and yet we know from historical, empirical experience, that that is never the case.

□ 1740

We cannot increase taxes, take more money out of the people's pockets and expect the economy to improve.

Mr. GEKAS. In that regard, Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, as the new Democrat that the President is supposed to be, he seems to be indulging a great deal in some of the old Democrat rhetoric of tax the rich or get the rich, and this particular tax package is veered toward what they consider rich, the people over 200,000. Now we learn it is over 100,000, and there are other theories that bring it down to 60,000 and 30,000.

So, Madam Speaker, rich depends on whose ox is being gored, I guess, or is in the eyes of the beholder.

Mr. ARCHER. If the President is permitted to redefine rich one more time, there will be no poverty in this country.

Mr. GEKAS. That is correct, but, if the gentleman would further yield, let us assume that was correct for a moment, that he was taxing the rich. Is it not true that the people over \$200,000—I think it is true, so I am answering my own question—have more disposable income than a person earning \$30,000 or should have? Is it not one of the basic tenets of the economy that we ought to be giving incentive and reason for the disposable income to be sent around in the economy through investment, and job creation and even in buying yachts

and other kinds of so-called luxury items just to keep the economy spurred, and to move the money around, and the investments and the business activity? Is that not one of the basic tenets of what those of us who wish to see an economy grow like to see happen?

Mr. ARCHER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] again is precisely correct, and, if he would reflect back on the 1990 budget agreement for which President George Bush was so severely criticized, the Democrats insisted in that bill that there be major new tax increases on the, quote, rich, and they also insisted that in that proposal there be a luxury tax on boats. Now the result of that, that entire agreement, was to harm the economy and to cancel jobs for people who were in the boat-building business.

So, Madam Speaker, it is *deja vu*, or, as Yogi Berra would say, "It is *deja vu* all over again," that this projected proposal of this President is so very similar to the budget proposal of 1990 with the taxes up front, quote, on the rich, unquote, and the spending reductions to come in the third, fourth, and fifth years.

Mr. GEKAS. And one other piece of news reporting that has occurred: I am convinced that his fellow Democrats, particularly in the Senate, are stressing the fact that spending cuts must be put into place ahead of any consideration, let alone imposition, of new taxes. Am I correct on that?

Mr. ARCHER. Of course the gentleman is correct, and there are a few thoughtful Democrats, and I am sure there are some in this Chamber, who understand that massive tax increases up front, and some retroactive, with spending reductions only to occur as a promise down the line, is not what the country needs.

Mr. GEKAS. One other question, Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield:

Is it true that the Committee on Ways and Means' final product on the tax negotiations would contain or do contain a retroactive feature on any of the new income taxes to be proposed? If that is so, I would like the specifics of that.

Mr. ARCHER. Yes; the rate increases are retroactive to the 1st of January, which means that many taxpayers are going to find that they misestimated their tax or they did not have enough withheld in the withholding part of their paycheck and, therefore, will face on April 15 an additional tax burden that they have not been able to prepare for.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] for having yielded to me.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for his questions.

If the public had been permitted to watch the deliberations of the Commit-

tee on Ways and Means, Madam Speaker, they would have seen Democrats, as a group on a straight party-line basis, vote to approve the Clinton energy tax which falls most heavily on middle income and elderly Americans. They would have seen, on a straight party-line vote, the Democrats vote to increase the taxes almost double on Social Security benefits. And they would have seen, on a straight party-line vote, the Democrats vote to transfer the new taxes on Social Security benefits, not back into the trust fund where they have gone in the past, but into the general Treasury where they could pay for new spending programs. And they would have seen the Democrats, on a straight party-line vote, defeat Republican attempts to provide a tax incentive to help self-employed persons acquire health insurance.

Let me lay out some of the things contained in the tax bill that will show up as a negative on the economy:

First, the bill reverses the fundamental principles of tax reform by increasing rates and restoring the culture of tax shelters. The President's tax bill will add two new regular rate brackets for individuals, the 36-percent rate for single persons making more than \$150,000 and \$140,000 for couples, and the 39.6-percent rate for those with income exceeding \$250,000. In case my colleagues forgot the campaign promises made by President Clinton, the people with \$115,000 are getting stuck with the tax the President promised would not hit people below \$100,000 dollars, and the people with incomes of \$250,000 are getting hit with the tax the President said would apply only to those with incomes of \$1 million.

It is interesting to note that President Bush in the campaign debates said that Clinton could not raise the money that he projected unless he lowered those thresholds significantly. He said that the President was dealing in political falsehoods, and now, by his own admission, he has lowered it to where it impacts on people with \$30,000 a year of family income.

There are also hidden rate increases in the President's package. The temporary rules phasing out permanent exemptions which add almost 1 percent of a marginal rate increase per family member to your tax rate and the rules limiting itemized deductions which add 1 percent to your tax rate would be made permanent. It is interesting to note that the tax law says you have certain legitimate tax deductions, not nearly as many as before the 1986 act, but they are still there for contributions to charities, for interest paid on your home mortgage, for your property taxes levied against your home, legitimate, authorized, legal tax deductions. But as your income rises under President Clinton's proposal, those deductions are phased out.

The last provision is of particular concern to charities, to home owners

with mortgages and to people living in States having income and property taxes. Removing the upper limit on income subject to the Federal health insurance tax adds about another 3 percent marginal rate for self-employed persons and 1½ percent for employees. Small business people, wives who might want to start their own business while their husbands are also working gainfully, can find that for a very small business their marginal tax increase can be over 50 percent when you include the self-employment tax of 15.3 percent.

As if the income tax rate situation were not bad enough, individuals have a second alternative minimum tax to deal with. Corporations will have another rate bracket and higher estimated tax hurdles. Family-owned businesses and farms will get socked with higher estate taxes, rates up to 55 percent. In a democracy such as ours the Government should never have its hand on the savings that one would like to pass on to their children and heirs of over 50 percent.

□ 1750

Of course, the businesses will have to be sold in many cases to pay the confiscatory taxes. The comprehensive energy tax on middle income taxpayers, which the President would rather call a Btu tax, will lower economic growth by \$35 to \$50 billion a year. It is not a tax on Btu's, it is a tax on middle income Americans, and it will cost the country and the economy at least one-half million jobs by 1998, and more after that.

President Clinton's energy tax will raise the cost of practically every good and service produced in America, forcing consumers to pay more and making American workers and companies less competitive in the world marketplace.

Factories using large amounts of energy will in the future not be built in America. They will be built overseas where Btu's are not taxed. I say to my colleagues, there is no other country in the world that taxes its raw energy, for a very good reason—because they know jobs will suffer.

The Committee on Ways and Means carved out additional exemptions and special deals to silence particular industries and to help make their program more politically popular in certain regions. But in doing so, they were required to increase the taxes on everyone else. These exemptions will lead and continue to lead to massive tax evasion.

For example, the fact that home heating oil has an exemption from the punitive higher level of Btu tax and the fact that home heating oil has exactly the same chemical properties as diesel fuel will mean, you guessed it, lots of trucks are going to be running on home heating oil to evade the tax.

It now seems likely that the other body will kill the energy tax when it

considers the President's tax bill. In light of this, it is hard to understand why the President is demanding that House Democrats support the energy tax. This seems to be a misguided sacrifice of Democrat Members to prove their partisan loyalty instead of their independent wisdom.

In the President's tax proposal, the elderly are specifically targeted for higher new taxes in addition to paying the extra taxes of the energy tax, and that will be on all the fuel to heat and cool their homes and drive their automobiles. They will see a near doubling of the energy taxes they pay on Social Security benefits.

These increased taxes on 10 million Social Security recipients, growing to 14 million in 1998 and increasing every year thereafter, would even be siphoned off from the Social Security Trust Fund in order to permit new spending in the Clinton plan.

With the added concern of the elderly that Medicare may be the next program cut or revised significantly under the President's health plan, it is no wonder the elderly are nervous.

Some of the justification of the Clinton administration for increasing taxes on Social Security beneficiaries is that they get more money back than they paid in. But just the reverse is true. It may have been true 5 or 10 years ago, but no more.

In a recent Congressional Research Service analysis, an official body of the Federal Government, it shows that under the current situation the average life expectancy of a 65-year-old man in this country is 15 years. But if he is an average Social Security recipient, it will take him 17.8 years to recover the money that has been paid in taxes for his benefit during his work life. Again, 17.8 years. That even includes the projection that he will get a cost-of-living increase in each of the 15 years that he lives, and it includes the repayment of compounded interest at the low Treasury rate during the time of his worklife.

Under the Clinton proposal, if you also include the increased taxes on income, it will take 28.8 years for that individual to recover what has been paid in to justify that Social Security benefit. There is no way that he can live long enough, and Clinton wants to reduce the net benefit to that individual.

In addition, look out if you are an elderly American who has to continue to work, either part time or full time, to pay your bills. Let me give an example where the marginal tax rate, coupled with the loss of benefits under the earnings limitation, how that will affect people to where they can end up getting less back from what they earn than what it costs them.

Here is an example. Following her husband's death, Mrs. Pensioner, aged 63, took a job at \$8,000 a year. She also had income of \$17,000 a year from a tax-

able pension and other savings, and she had \$10,000 in Social Security benefits.

In order to make ends meet, she is thinking about an additional part-time job that would pay her \$1,000 a year. Should she take the job?

Not if President Clinton's tax proposal goes into effect, because as a result of the interrelationship of Federal income taxes, payroll taxes, Social Security earnings limitation, and the Clinton Social Security tax proposal, Mrs. Pensioner would actually be \$35 worse off financially. Her marginal tax rate on that extra \$1,000 would be 103.5 percent, and that is exclusive of State and local taxes.

What could be more misguided to hit the elderly?

We are just getting started talking about what is in this bill. If you happen to work in a restaurant you are going to be impacted negatively, with the chance that you are going to lose your job, because it will have a major setback under the Clinton proposal. Cutting the deductibility of business meals from 80 to 50 percent will mean a direct drop in restaurant spending and a direct increase in restaurant worker unemployment.

Limitations on pension contributions contained in the bill would discourage pension savings, with the result that the current generation will have even less of an expectation of a secure retirement.

A 250-percent increase in taxes paid by waterway users will jeopardize the American barge industry as well as the industries which are dependent upon water-borne transportation.

The tax bill will add immeasurable complexity to the tax law, especially in the taxation of international operations which are so essential to gain exports for this country and create new jobs for American workers. For example, one provision moves the U.S. tax system further away from the world norm by imposing U.S. taxes on all but a part of the profits of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies. These changes will only add to the lack of competitiveness of American companies and increase the incentive to build factories abroad.

Although a number of Republicans support the concept of wage subsidies through the tax system for low income families with children, we really must question the huge increase for the earned income tax credit in the administration's proposal, whether or not it is designed as some sort of offset for the Clinton energy tax. The EITC, as it is called, was substantially increased in both 1986 and 1990. Yet we have no empirical research on whether these multibillion increases have actually increased either work effort or family income.

The Human Resources Subcommittee received testimony in a hearing last month that the credit may actually

have a work reduction effect in the phaseout range, and that the administration proposal may boost this effect by expanding the phaseout range. According to the witness, a labor economist of the American Enterprise Institute, there could be as many as 15 workers in the phaseout range of roughly \$17,000 to \$30,000 for every worker in the phasein range of zero to 6,000.

□ 1800

The importance of considering worker response in the phaseout range is demonstrated by a recent study by the Congressional Research Service showing that marginal tax rates in the phaseout range reach more than 70 percent.

Confiscatory tax rates of this sort could cripple work incentive.

Thus, the administration's proposal could have the ironic effect of reducing work by subsidizing wages.

It is folly to spend \$28 billion over 5 years on a policy that may not have its intended effect, especially in a budget supposedly focused on deficit reduction.

The human resources provisions of the committee bill raise taxes, spend too much money, continue the committee's long-term agenda of infiltrating the Federal budget with more and more entitlement programs, and pass up several opportunities to improve Government services.

We applaud and strongly support the half-dozen human resources provisions that produce budget savings.

Taken together, they account for \$1.2 billion over 5 years.

But the majority bill also increases spending in more than 20 programs and creates one entirely new entitlement program. These spending provisions will cost almost \$1.9 billion over 5 years. When the cuts and new spending are combined, they increase the deficit by about \$.7 billion over 5 years.

That is one reason why the committee found it necessary to increase taxes so much.

Most Americans think we are raising taxes in order to reduce the deficit. But in fact, a significant percentage of the tax money in the human resources provisions of the bill, just like a significant percentage of money in the entire bill, is used to increase spending.

One tax raised by the majority is particularly objectionable.

Created originally as a temporary surtax on the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, called FUTA, to shore up unemployment funding shortfalls in the 1970's, the surtax has achieved permanent status as a temporary tax.

Now the majority wants to extend the tax yet again because, they claim, the revenues are needed to meet future shortfalls in the unemployment trust funds.

Yet the administration's own estimates show that the unemployment

trust funds, without any tax increases, will have a surplus of \$13.5 billion in 1997 and \$14.6 billion in 1998—the 2 years for which the surtax is supposedly extended.

There is no justification related to unemployment insurance for extending the FUTA tax at this time.

The only clear employment effect is that it will kill jobs because of its disincentive to employers to hire people with a higher tax on payroll.

Why then is this tax being extended? The answer is simple: To pay for new human resources spending called for in the committee bill.

Most budget experts agree that the major cause of rising deficits is the wild growth of entitlement programs. Nonetheless, the committee bill creates yet another entitlement program, this one for child welfare—despite the fact that there are already six open-ended entitlement programs devoted to child welfare.

These programs have been among the most rapidly growing in the entire Federal budget. Between 1981 and 1992, spending on these entitlements grew from \$474 million to \$2.5 billion, an increase of over 400 percent. Republicans offered an amendment to allow States more flexibility in how these growing resources are used, thereby reducing or eliminating the need for yet another entitlement, but the amendment was rejected on a straight party line vote.

Perhaps most surprising of all, both the administration and committee Democrats opposed putting additional work incentives in the Aid to Families With Dependent Children [AFDC] Program.

Republicans proposed allowing AFDC recipients who start a small business to accumulate a higher level of assets in these businesses before they lose AFDC eligibility.

These small businesses have proven to be an effective method for helping AFDC recipients, many of them women, get off welfare by starting small businesses. Expanding the asset limit would allow these enterprising mothers to create their own safety net by building equity in the fledgling business while they are still receiving AFDC benefits.

The majority supported this program in subcommittee but, when it came to the full committee, they changed their position and said, "Oh, now we don't want to do that now. Let's wait." Then they came forward in the Medicare section with a 2-year freeze on provider payments that will particularly hurt rural Medicare-dependent hospitals, as well as many inner-city hospitals.

Many rural hospitals will likely have to close their doors, if this bill is signed into law, depleting the resources of already medically vulnerable rural areas even further.

Ironically, this is occurring at a time when everyone is worried over how

rural America, with its special problems and limited resources, will cope with the restructuring of the Nation's health care system.

In a misguided attempt to find a solution for overutilization, this bill, through the ill-conceived expansion of the physician ownership and referral ban, will cripple the growth of efficient health care provider networks. Once again, the irony here is that the health care provider networks that this bill stymies are the same provider networks that Democrats and Republicans alike have said are critical to health care reform.

Because of recent announcements by certain Members of the other body, I am optimistic that common sense will prevail and that we will not be forced to vote on the President's legislation in its current form this week.

I await the outcome of negotiations and the decision of the Committee on Rules, which I understand is even now taking place.

Madam Speaker, I yield to our respected minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I hate to interrupt the gentleman while he is making his exposition here. I think for those within the sound of our voices, we ought to make it very clear that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], is our ranking Republican member on the Committee on Ways and Means, which, incidentally, is dominated by the majority party, 24 Members of the Democratic side, 14 on our side; is that not correct?

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. So when the gentleman earlier talked about straight party line votes on these individual amendments, he was talking about 24 Democrats following a party line against our 14 Members that the gentleman hopes to command, but independently minded individuals who are willing to listen to a good argument from time to time and vote their conscience. But it was strictly party-line votes that we saw the gentleman was confronted with.

First, I want to, before going any further, commend and compliment the gentleman for taking time in these special orders for several days, because we are headed for a big vote on Thursday, when the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 is considered.

As I understand it, this is going to be about a 1,500 page bill, containing 14 titles and thousands of provisions. And since we have been told that the debate on this huge bill will be limited to 1 day, it is imperative that Members and the American public be informed of the many details buried in the bill through these special orders that the gentleman from Texas has taken and will be joined in, I am sure, by other members of his committee, several who I see on the floor at this moment.

Now, this reconciliation bill can be described first and foremost, I guess, as the largest tax bill this Congress has ever considered, as the gentleman has pointed out.

I guess one of the things that distresses me is while we were being told during the course of the campaign and subsequent to that, "Oh, we will have at least two times in volume expenditure reductions versus a dollar in taxes," and what is that ratio now today, as the gentleman sees it?

Mr. ARCHER. In the first year, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, that the ratio is 38 to 1 in tax increases over spending cuts. And in the second year, 24 to 1. But in reality, the net spending cuts, if you consider the new increased-spending programs, and I think we should point out to the American people, the President keeps saying he has made these specific spending cuts, and there are some specific spending cuts in his proposal, but they are offset by all of his spending increases in the first 2 years. So it is a zero-net-spending cut in the first 2 years.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I was distressed, when he mentioned during his earlier part of his remarks, that very few of the people would realize, I guess, that in the marginal tax increases that he alluded to will be, the effective date for them will be retroactive to, is it January 3, 1993?

□ 1810

Mr. ARCHER. I think January 1.

Mr. MICHEL. January 1, excuse me. Normally we would enact tax bills or any kind of legislative proposal here effective 30 days or some arbitrary figure after the date of enactment, which means passing the House, passing the Senate, going to conference, and being signed into law by the President.

In this case, as the gentleman has pointed out, we are going to get caught unaware of the fact that we ought to be adding up more in our withholding to make up for these increases that take effect after the bill is eventually passed, if it is, and assume some part of it may very well be enacted into law January 1, 1993. That is a significant amount for any number of people.

While some people like to boost their withholding taxes a little bit so that they will not have to ante up at the end of the year, but rather maybe have a little in return, that certainly is not going to be the case next year.

As the gentleman knows, the gentleman from Illinois is going before the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will also be doing, I am sure, on Wednesday to make our respective cases on amendments that we would like to have made in order to this omnibus reconciliation bill.

I have been concentrating my efforts, and of course, the gentleman from

Texas has, too, across the board, but with emphasis on the energy tax, that Btu tax the gentleman referred to earlier in the course of his remarks, which cuts right across the board and affects probably every individual American.

As I understand it, that is about a \$72 billion tax out of the pockets of all Americans over the next 5 years, but, of course, that too represents a broken promise made during the course of the campaign where "oh, these taxes are going to be applied only to the rich and the wealthy, and they will not stretch down to the average individual."

I looked at some of the gentleman's tables, and I will tell the Members, it is so dramatic, it is unfortunate that we do not have some graphics here today, but maybe in the next special order or two, enough graphics to show that middle-income Americans are the ones who are really taking the brunt of this. Is that not correct, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. ARCHER. The gentleman is correct, because the lower-income people will receive this major increase in EITC refundable tax credit, and it is interesting to note that the energy tax, which hits middle-income Americans to the most extent, and of course destroys the competitiveness of companies, is one which will generate, according to estimates, a projected \$100 billion of new revenue over 5 years.

There is, of course, included the purchase by governments of this, in which case there is a rebate, so they come back to the \$71.5 billion that they say will actually impact on the deficit.

However, by the time they give it back under the ETIC, the net impact on the operating deficit is only \$31 billion, so it raises en gross almost \$100 billion to only net out roughly \$31 billion against the deficit.

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman will continue to yield, in other words, I guess it is an admission on the part of the administration that it is a bad tax per se, and in order to take care of lower-income people who will eventually have to pay this tax, let us come around on the back side and increase their food stamp allotment or their earned income tax credit, and that wipes out the overall gain that was supposed to be made by increased revenues, is that right?

Mr. ARCHER. Exactly. It provides for bigger welfare benefits in order to offset the cost of the energy tax on lower-income people, and those bigger welfare benefits are almost \$30 billion.

Mr. MICHEL. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, when we have a tax that requires a second step to mitigate the impact of the tax, it really should raise a red flag in everyone's mind out there. This two-step process is, frankly, too complicated, and I guess that is why the gentleman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and I will be asking the Committee on Rules to allow consideration

of an amendment to strike the energy tax increase, and we will substitute specific cuts for the energy tax.

That is a difficult thing to do, but in our budget resolution that we had earlier prepared by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and budget members. We had a sufficient amount of specific expenditure reductions to make up for what we might have gained otherwise by way of tax increases.

We want to be credible when we go to the Committee on Rules and say, "We want to eliminate this Btu tax, and in lieu of that, these are the specific expenditure reductions we would make," because, as I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] have found back home with our folks, cut spending first before raising the taxes.

We are prepared to do that, and I would hope, and we might as well make the pitch now for the majority, and particularly the Speaker, to take note that we would hope that we get the kind of rule that would give the gentleman from Texas an opportunity to offer his amendment and the gentleman from Illinois and whomever, for that matter, not wholesale, but if we could at least get two or three, then we could concentrate the debate on those significant issues and make the case. Then we will accept the will of the House, whether it is accepted or rejected.

As the gentleman pointed out in his Committee on Ways and Means, he was overridden by overwhelming numbers. I should point out for the record that in the Committee on Rules, the traffic cop that determines how we are going to consider this legislation, the Democrats have nine members, we have four members, two to one plus one. If the iron-fisted hand of the Speaker says that "it has got to be this way," it is going to be that way, strictly on the strength of the votes that are cast in that committee. We would like it to be otherwise.

In my earlier days in this body I could remember those days when the votes were split in the Committee on Rules and there were bona fide conservatives serving on that committee on the majority side that would vote with us on occasion to open up the process and let the American public really get a full flavor of what we are talking about.

Here, as the gentleman has pointed out, the largest tax increase in the history of the country, and we will probably be limited to 1 day of debate, when I can recall matters of far less importance being debated for a week or more in this body, giving Members an opportunity to offer amendments and then making their case or not making their case, and it is decided by the full Members of the House.

Mr. ARCHER. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and the American people expect this Congress to be different, for this Congress to be a reform Congress where the people were involved and able to participate.

A lot of people, I know, in my district, and I am sure all over the country, do not understand how they can do this. I am asked over and over again, "How can they close a meeting? How can they deny you the right to offer an amendment?"

The people of this country should know that under the House rules that were handed down as one of the first votes in this Congress by the majority that controls the Congress, that it is simply a numbers game. Once they have a majority on any committee, they can deny you the full democratic process. That is particularly true in the Committee on Rules.

I hope the American people will watch what happens this week, not just as to how much time we are given to get up here and talk in debate, how many amendments are we permitted to vote on the floor that might offer alternatives that would improve this bill.

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman, if I might, going back to the Btu tax, am I correct that it would, under present conditions, that every American would probably pay at least 8 cents per gallon more at the gas pump if this energy tax were to be adopted?

Mr. ARCHER. If they do not create more exemptions. For every exemption the increase, the basic tax would go up and the tax at that gasoline pump will go up accordingly. It is now roughly 8 cents to 9 cents a gallon, as best we can estimate, that is already built into the bill.

In addition, the utility bills that people pay for their electricity or for their gas or for any fuel that heats or cools their home is going to be increased significantly. And it is all going to be built in.

□ 1820

Whether we will succeed in having that put and disclosed on the bill each month, which is where it should be, or rather hidden in the total bill is something else.

Mr. MICHEL. That is one of those things that does concern me. A Btu energy tax is kind of a hidden tax, is it not?

Mr. ARCHER. Yes.

Mr. MICHEL. And it ought to be publicly exposed for all to see. But is that going to be required then? Or will that be an automatic consequence?

Mr. ARCHER. That was one of the amendments that I wanted to offer in committee, that I was not permitted to offer. But it also is true that this tax, according to the administration's own admissions, will be roughly \$471 per

year per family in this country, if you consider the impact across the board.

Mr. MICHEL. Well I know that every time you go to the grocery store, every time you go to buy a new appliance, every time you are going to buy anything that uses energy, or is manufactured or produced or transported, you are going to be paying higher prices for those goods, and I think the American public ought to be aware of that.

Mr. ARCHER. If it is made in this country, because no other country taxes its raw energy. So the clothes on your back, if they are made in this country, are going to cost you more. That is going to push consumers more to buying foreign goods and less domestic goods, and therefore be very, very negative on job creation in this country.

Mr. MICHEL. It is a great distinction that the gentleman pointed out, and just so the American public is aware, even paper products that we all use in our homes, if you are talking about paper towels, Kleenex will be more expensive because the paper industry uses a great deal of energy to manufacture its products. There is no one that really escapes this thing, and the gentleman having taken the time to alert the American public to what is going on I think is to be applauded.

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Madam Speaker, I appreciate everything the gentleman from Texas has said during this special order, and also our leader who is here speaking with us and standing behind what the Republican Party has stood for for quite some time.

But I want to talk about jobs for a minute. I think that one of the No. 1 issues that was campaigned on on both sides was jobs and more jobs. We also campaigned on the issue, or we have agreed pretty well that small business is where those jobs are going to be created, and that it is going to be the private sector, small business, the entrepreneurs, the people who are willing to invest their money for their economic future and the economic future of their employees. So I want to talk about the tax consequences that are associated with income generated by small businesses such as subchapter S corporations, partnerships, sole proprietorships, income that flows through to individuals irrespective of whether these profits are withdrawn from the business. The gentleman from Texas covered some of this, but I think it is worth repeating about these increased tax rates applicable to individuals, which would require additional taxes to be paid by them in these pass-through companies which otherwise could be retained in the companies as working capital for expansion purposes.

The administration has proposed, and the gentleman gave these figures ear-

lier but I want to give them again because it's possible that some of the Members did not quite understand what was happening, they have proposed to increase the individual tax rates from the present 31 percent to 36 percent for joint taxable incomes of \$140,000 and over and for \$115,000 and over for single filers. In addition, a 10-percent surtax would be established for incomes of \$250,000 and over, creating a new 39.6 percent tax bracket. And when you take into account the President's proposal to lift the health insurance tax cap, and the proposed further limitation on itemized deductions, a new maximum marginal rate of nearly 44 percent will be in place.

This large tax increase would limit the working capital and expansion funds available to small businesses which are taxed as individuals. And since there is general agreement that small business growth and expansion is necessary to grow the economy and create new, permanent jobs, increasing tax rates on small businesses is counterproductive.

During the hearings on the President's proposal, the administration denied the negative effect higher individual rates would have on these businesses and future growth and job creation. The administration claims that these tax increases would bring rates back to the levels of the mid-1980's when times were good, so this large increase would not have adverse effects on small business.

What the President fails to realize is that with the deductions available before the 1986 Tax Reform Act was enacted, effective tax rates were much lower during that time, but the deductions were eliminated in 1986 so this tax hike will hurt small businesses more than ever.

But do not believe me. Listen to what the small businessmen and women have to say throughout the country from the following excerpts from letters received from small business owners concerning the effects of this proposal, and you can decide whether to believe the business people in your district or the administration. Here are the letters.

The proposal to increase the top rate from 31 percent to 36 percent, with an additional 10 percent surtax on our taxable income exceeding \$250,000, has caused us to defer most of our previously planned expansions for 1993 and 1994.

As a direct result of the increase of taxes on Subchapter S corporations from 31 to 36 percent we are freezing all future expansion plans for 1993.

Letter after letter of businessmen, small businesses that must retain capital for expansion purposes because of the tax increase, so the small companies will not be able to do so.

Here is another one:

We've retained almost all of the profits of our S corporations after taxes to cover growth and increased costs of buildings,

trucks, fork lifts, inventory and accounts receivable. We do not need increased taxes.

We're a small, 21-employee Subchapter S corporation. We had planned on adding two employees in the first quarter of the calendar year. As the tax plan unfolded, we started putting off hiring. Now, after talking with our customers and other business associates, we have decided to cancel these plans for 1993.

Hundreds of companies out there, people that want to expand, the entrepreneurs, the people that are the key to the job creation in this country are being taxed out of existence if we allow it.

Incidentally, while I was back home in southwest Missouri, a good friend of mine down there told me that he thought the Btu tax ought to be called the "buy thermal underwear tax," and I think there may be more truth to that than fiction. And the Btu tax, as the gentleman from Texas said, we will be the only country in the world taxing energy at its source. We cannot allow this plan to go through as it was passed out of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would observe that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK], as a small businessman himself, understands empirically what this bill will do in a negative way on small business people and the reduction of jobs at that level.

The gentleman is also completely accurate when he talks about the massiveness of this tax increase. Most Americans do not really understand that in America today, Americans today pay the highest taxes in all of the history of this country if you include State, local, and Federal taxes, in the aggregate, and it is the highest in history.

The problem in the United States is not that Americans are taxed too little. The problem is Government spends too much.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague very much for yielding. I wanted to pursue with the gentleman a couple of points that have been talked about, not to repeat, but to enlarge, and then I have a couple of other points that I think need to be made about this bill at this time.

We have talked a great deal tonight about the impacts of the energy tax, but one thing we have not really discussed is the triple whammy effect of that tax. You just made a point that Americans are paying more taxes now than at any other time in our history if we look at combined burdens of Federal, State, and local taxes. This increase in the energy tax is just one aspect of the problem that it creates. It does create a new Federal tax liability for the people of America.

But it is going to increase the property taxes of every community and

every State throughout our Nation, because every small town is going to pay more to heat every school, every town-hall, fuel every truck, and the cost of asphalt, which is a big item in small budgets in small towns is going to go up dramatically, because it is petroleum-based.

□ 1830

So this is only the first round of tax increases that this bill is going to cause; it is going to raise local property taxes, and it is going to raise people's State taxes.

One of my colleagues on the other side who is on our committee made the point that his State has a cap on local taxes, and so it will not raise property taxes in his town. Well, it certainly will then cut services, because if you have to pay more for energy costs in a town budget, you have less money to spend on education or the public library or other public services that are critical to the quality of life in the communities of our Nation.

I think that that triple-whammy aspect of this energy tax has been talked about too little.

The second point I wanted to make is that the crisis America faces is an economic crisis, and fundamentally a jobs crisis, and yet every product that we export abroad is going to cost more because of this energy tax, and it is going to cost more at a time when Europe is having a hard time, so all the multinationals have cut their prices to the bone, and our guys have to cut their prices to the bone. The competition out there is extraordinary, and to keep market share, which is the only way we can keep exporting, we have got to stay price-competitive. So we pass this tax.

TAXES AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, at a time when Europe is in hard times and price competition in the international market is extraordinarily intense, we are going to impose on our international competitors the energy tax and several other increased costs in this bill.

Half of America's economic growth in the last 2 years came from increased exports. We cannot continue to grow our part of that export market, gain market share in the international market if we keep forcing the price of American goods up in that market at a time when our competitors are forcing their prices down.

In my State, which is per capita the No. 1 exporter in the Nation, this is going to cost jobs, and yet defense cuts are already costing jobs. The decline in the commercial aircraft industry is

costing jobs. Connecticut is in desperate shape, and this bill, because of what it does to the multinationals, what it does to small businesses is going to cost additional jobs in my State.

When I think about this tax bill, I see in my mind all of those small companies I have visited in my State literally holding on by their fingernails, surviving month by month, year by year, hoping to make it until the economy turns around. Now we are going to hit them in this bill with three new tax increases for every small business.

Mr. ARCHER. If the gentleman will yield on that, I compliment her for presenting the impact of this tax in a way that I do not think most Americans understand.

The President would like to label anyone who is opposed to this energy tax as just someone who is trying to protect big oil. Not so. The impact is across the board in this country and will cost job after job after job as well as raise the cost not just to the operating of the cities but also increased medical-care costs that use considerable energy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Absolutely, and you know, our committee is also responsible for trade policy, and over the years the cry, "Let us have a level playing field," has been stronger and stronger, because our companies know that if they are going to export it has to be by the same rules. So now here we are in a sense changing the rules of the game on our own companies to their disadvantage at a time when job growth in America is the No. 1 issue.

You know, we had testimony before our committee that the energy tax is going to cost between 600,000 and 1 million jobs, and by 1998, I believe, our gross domestic product will be \$39 billion less just because of this provision in this tax bill.

So the energy-tax issue is not a small issue. It is not about energy conservation. It is about a competitive America. It is about jobs for our kids. It is about career opportunities. It really is tragic that we have allowed it to become such a narrowly focused discussion, and somehow this is only whether you are for or against this new President; this is whether you are for or against America.

I also want to talk about one other aspect of this bill that I know the gentleman mentioned earlier, and that is that it is a massive shift of resources from investing to consuming. If there is one message we have heard every hearing we have had for the 5 years I have been on the Committee on Ways and Means, from everyone who has testified, is that we need to change our tax code so that it rewards investing and does not reward consuming, because investing creates jobs, and consuming does not.

But this bill takes money out of the investing sector, that is, corporate profits, and yes, you have got to have corporate profits, dirty word though in America that it is made out to be, to buy new machinery, open new plants and to create new jobs. Likewise, with the high earners, they are the guys who buy stocks on Wall Street. It is not my kids who are starting out earning not very big salaries and making car payments. They are not funding the investments that create jobs.

So to raise the taxes out of that investing sector and literally suck out the dollars that create jobs and then give it back to low-income folks who need protection from the energy tax, Government spending which tends to provide programs for low-income people, and now, I have been a big advocate of those programs, but those folks need jobs. They need jobs, not Government support.

So this bill moves us as a Nation in exactly the wrong direction, and the public needs to know that, needs to contact their Congressman and needs to help us move this around so that America's economy will be strong in the future.

You know, the gentleman mentioned the health-care provisions in this bill and the way the energy tax pushes health-care costs up. But this bill does something else that is truly bizarre, if you are out there in the streets with the folks that you represent. It "saves money"; I mean, the biggest saving that the President's budget, entire budget, makes is the savings that my subcommittee was supposed to make in Medicare, in the growth of Medicare spending.

Instead of going item by item like the Republicans have proposed in cutting reimbursements to people who sell durable medical equipment and things like that where there is some logic to it, my subcommittee and the Democrat-controlled committee chose to freeze reimbursements to hospitals and doctors. Now, maybe you think that does not affect you, but in my State, in my State those savings that we count as savings in Washington are going to be increased bills to you at home. That is not going to save you money. That is going to increase your costs.

In Connecticut, it is even set out on a bill as "uncompensated care," and people now can see that one-third of the cost of their hospital stay was not even a cost related to their care. It was related to somebody else's care that the Government did not choose to pay for.

So that freeze on hospital reimbursements just gets shifted to you and I and the next person, and it raises your insurance premiums. It increases your portion of hospital bills that you have to pay, and that is the cruelest kind of cut in spending I know, because it is just like the energy tax. It does not just hit you once, it hits you twice.

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield further on that, because that relates to what our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK], was just talking about, the small business person is struggling to be able to find the resources to pay for the health-care costs for his or her employees, and as the Government pays less, there will be most costs shifted over to their insurance policies, and it will become even more difficult for them to be able to make available health insurance for their employees.

Mr. HANCOCK. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HANCOCK. Madam Speaker, in the comments by the gentlewoman having to do with the increase in medical expenses and the hospitals, I have seen some figures here recently on what the Btu tax is going to cost the hospitals. They use an enormous amount of energy. It seems to me like it was someplace in the neighborhood of 6 to—I do not want to give a figure, but it was up in the millions of dollars that the Btu tax that the hospitals were going to have to pick up, so there again, the compounding effect, as the gentlewoman said, the three or four steps of that Btu tax, and by the time it all washes through the economy, we still do not end up where the President wanted to go though regardless of how he is talking about it, because it is the bottom line.

The President says he is doing all of this for deficit reduction, deficit reduction. The deficit, based on his own figures, the national debt is \$4.370 trillion right now, and after his plan, 5 years after his plan goes into effect, the deficit goes, I think, to \$6.141 trillion.

In other words, we talk about we are doing this and people are going to have to sacrifice, and yet we are talking about even if everything goes exactly the way he wants it to go, the most rosy scenario is that we are going to increase the national debt by almost 50 percent in the next 5 years. Now anybody who is just logical at all knows that you cannot continue to do that, because we are borrowing money now to pay the interest on the debt. You cannot keep doing that. Nobody can, a country, a family, or a business. We cannot continue to go that route.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. You know, that is a very good point that the gentleman makes.

In terms of deficit reduction, his plan will increase the national debt over a trillion dollars.

□ 1840

In terms of jobs, it is clearly going to cost jobs because that same little guy who is going to pay more for health care for his employees of what we did

to freeze Medicare reimbursement also has to pay higher Medicare tax and a higher energy tax just to keep his business going. So it is going to cost jobs in the small-business sector, which is the only sector growing at all.

Mr. HANCOCK. Actually the figure is almost \$2 trillion, \$1.9 trillion.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. On the debt.

Mr. HANCOCK. On the national debt. And that national debt, you know we have to borrow money to refinance it every time we turn around. Now, one of these days—I hope it never happens—but one of these days somebody might say, "Hey, I don't know whether I want to buy those bonds or not."

Then we have got serious problems.

It has happened in other countries.

Mr. ARCHER. The gentlelady made a great, great point on the deterrent and the disadvantage to our exported products, in that over the last 4 years the majority of new jobs that have been created in the United States are related to exports. There is a good reason for that, because we are currently as Americans spending 100 percent of our net earnings.

Now, if the American consumer is going to be expected to buy, to create the demand and jobs, that American consumer is going to have to do it on the credit card.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. That is a very important point, that we are spending 100 percent of our net income, so we cannot increase our buying.

Mr. ARCHER. We can if we want to buy more on credit. But our real opportunity to create jobs for Americans is to tap the export market. And this bill is totally negative on our ability to export products around the world.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. So when you look at the President's promise of deficit reduction, it is certainly not accomplished by this bill, when you look at the need to create jobs, this will cost jobs, not create jobs. And when you look at his concern with health care costs, this will push those costs up, not help us get control of them.

I think that is a very serious fundamental criticism of this bill.

There is just one last thing that I want to talk about before we close off tonight because it has to do with how Government serves people. Government has to be predictable or people cannot invest and know what the terms are going to be of where they put their money. We have tried to keep that tax law as constant as we could to encourage a strong economy.

It is stunning that, in this bill, 75 years of precedent are going to be overturned and not even overturned by clear law, overturned by fuzzy-headed law. And then the Secretary of the Treasury, given the power on his own right, without any approval from Congress, to simply redefine certain trans-

to move them into a different tax bracket and leave a person paying more taxes after he had planned on a certain level of tax liability.

We have never given the Secretary of Treasury that right. But he will have the right to redefine what is a capital gain and what is ordinary income, and he is going to be able to redefine this—we gave him a list in the bill of transactions he could define as constituting ordinary income and therefore subject to the higher rates instead of capital gains and therefore subject to lower rates. But then we give him this extraordinary power where he can redefine lots of transactions, and transaction he wants to redefine, if he thinks it has been done, in his opinion, as a way of avoiding the higher rate.

Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has been on the committee, on this committee, longer than I have. I would ask him the question: In your experience, have you ever seen that kind of power delegated to a Secretary of the Treasury over the lives of the people of America?

Mr. ARCHER. I cannot recall such a broad delegation of legislative power that belongs to this body, not to the executive branch, in the 22 years that I have been on the committee. It is always a source of complaint to me, in my town meetings people can say, "How can the IRS do this? How can they issue these regs? How can they do these various things?" In some instances, the Congress orders them to do it, but in other instances the Congress gives them a blank check to do whatever they wish to do to the taxpayers of this country.

I believe that is such a serious offense that it should be resisted in this bill as it should be resisted in other bills that come before the Congress.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. It is just one of the most egregious examples of some of the underlying problems this bill creates, if that provision is in there, because this bill for the first time in a while now creates a big difference between capital gains rate and ordinary income rate.

So the President is afraid that he will do exactly what we heard in our hearings will happen, that he will create the old gaming of the system that created the tax shelters, that created all of this real estate we do not need and created a lot of problems for us in past years. Of course, we did have testimony that this bill was going to create those kinds of games all over again. And those games have been destructive of creating good jobs in America that make us competitive abroad and provide well-paying career opportunities for our kids.

Mr. ARCHER. Well, the gentlelady is correct. In addition, there will be much gaming, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, in the energy tax, as people attempt to get out from this punitive tax and find exemptions and loopholes in it.

In addition, it is interesting to note that this bill gives a new Federal tariff czar complete authority to make a determination without any particular formula as to how much energy content is in a product entering the United States of America, manufactured abroad, and then apply a tariff to it.

This is likely going to be in violation of the world trade rules and will likely precipitate retaliation against the United States of America and our products around the world, which could be highly negative to the economies of all the world.

This is an unseen factor that is in there. The administrative cost of this energy tax is going to be enormously complex and going to create an entire new bureaucracy. People are going to wonder why there are more and more Federal employees.

It makes no sense.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's comments very much, and his leadership on the committee and on this tax bill and in developing this special order. I hope that from it our colleagues will understand how many problems there are with this bill and what a profound and negative impact it is going to have on the economic strength of our Nation.

I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for her contributions.

□ 1850

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Madam Speaker, I think it is important that we talk a little bit about the President's tax plan and some of his campaign promises and what the Ways and Means Committee offered. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and as a new Member, it was an enlightening process for me, because it was a very important tax bill to come before the American people.

First, I would like to talk about the question of fairness and the openness of the process by which we bring this matter before the full House, hopefully this Thursday.

To begin with, people have been debating taxes and the Federal deficit throughout the campaigns of 1992 and obviously into this legislative session, so it is not a new issue that comes before the House.

In addition, specifically on this bill, Members have debated among themselves in committee on the various positions of deficit reduction and funding the budget package.

In addition, it is a bit ironic to hear Members talk about the fact that we may have only 1 day of debate on this piece of legislation as they debate the

legislation here before the House in the procedure we know as special orders. Any Member can come before the House, of course, and ask for time, and generally receive the time that they wish in order to make public their views on this very important issue of deficit reduction and economic stimulus for this Nation.

So Americans should keep in mind this process, that it is with a bit of tongue-in-cheek that Members come before the House and criticize the majority for not giving them time to debate this tax program while they are debating and criticizing and critiquing the tax program. There seems to be a great inconsistency in that logic as they present their case.

The fact is they are using the House time to debate the package and it is not limited to 1 day, but I am sure we are going to hear many speeches, not just in special orders but in the time we call 1 minutes at the start of our legislative business as well.

Next, I would also like to address the issue of fairness in the Ways and Means Committee process. The committees did take many hours of public testimony from a whole host and variety of groups. A lot of the debate, of course, has been focused on the energy tax, the Btu tax. At first people jokingly said, "Oh, we finally figured out, we are going to tax the British to resolve the deficit."

And of course, as we got down to seriously studying the impact of the energy tax on this country, different proposals and refinements were suggested to make the President's proposal much better.

So the committee did deliberate in public, received tremendous testimony from every region of the country from a variety of interest groups, paid lobbyists and not, consumer groups as well who came in and gave their opinions on the deficit reduction package, on the earned income tax credit for the working poor in our Nation, to the energy tax, to the effect of the corporate taxes as well. So the process was open.

Then it was time for the committee to get down to work in what we call a markup, a work session on the bill, where we considered the various amendments. We considered privately dozens of amendments and in public many amendments were offered before the committee. Most were rejected.

It came to the point where the chairman tells us that it was necessary to expedite the process so that we would not be stuck here all summer long trying to craft a tax bill, and the two caucuses went into private session.

Yes, we did emerge with a Democratic proposal. There was a lot of debate inside the room, if you will, with no lobbyists, no TV cameras there. Great progress was made, and we did

reach a consensus on the Democratic side, and I believe as well on the Republican side in terms of their position as well.

Refinements were made. Changes were made. Arguments were made with the White House. Some of us won some of our arguments and lost others.

I can tell you that the President was heavily involved directly, as was his Executive level staff in trying to bring this issue to a close.

So yes, sometimes you do close the doors and you do shut out the TV cameras and the newspaper reporters and all the lobbyists on this Capitol Hill, and you roll up your sleeves and craft a compromise that truly reflects the needs and concerns of a variety of regions of the country.

So many times it seemed to me that it was not a specific Member talking. It was a Member from the Northeast talking to a Member from the Northwest and arguing with the oil production States about the effect of one kind of energy tax over another. It did occur.

We went back into public session, of course. Amendments were offered again in public, were voted on in public. The bill was sent to the Budget Committee, which is our process, and to the Rules Committee and to the House floor in a public vote.

There is a bit of smoke out there in terms of how open the process was. I think clearly public testimony was listened to, adhered to in many instances. Good ideas were suggested to make this fair and to make this a good piece of legislation.

That does not mean it is going to be an easy piece of legislation. That leads me to the President and what he has talked about for the past year as a candidate, as an individual citizen, as a Governor, and now as our President.

He said that we should have tax fairness in this country, that those who made a lot of money in the 1980's ought to be called upon to help reduce the deficit and to meet some of the social needs that remain in this Nation during the 1990's to take us into a very competitive situation in the year 2000.

When you increase the deficit by \$3 trillion, as we have done over the past 12 years, and both Congress and the administration can find fault and take blame for that, you do not erase that \$3 trillion deficit in just 120 days of a new administration. It is going to take time. It is going to take patience, but most of all, as the President has said, it takes fairness. It takes fairness and sacrifice.

The premier part of this piece of legislation, which many colleagues on the other side of the aisle fail to address, is that we are asking the millionaires in this country to pay a surtax on their incomes. We are asking the millionaires to help pay for this reduction in deficits.

We are also asking some corporations, some corporations, not all cor-

porations in this country, but some to pay a little bit more of their corporate earnings, of their profits, to help rebuild America by reducing the deficit and providing some other tax incentives, which I will go into.

We are asking those corporations who earn more than \$10 million a year to—instead of paying a top rate of 34 percent—to pay a top rate of 35 percent.

How many corporations are in that category? Twenty-seven hundred. We are asking the 2,700 most wealthy corporations in America to pay a little bit more, 1 percent, just 1 percent for America. That is all we are asking.

The President proposed a 2-percent increase, to increase it from 34 to 36. Because of the public testimony we received, we argued successfully with the President to drop the income tax credit that he proposed as part of his package.

We did not take the savings that would be left over from that credit and spend it on a social program. No, we said you therefore do not need to raise the corporate tax rate that extra 1 percent, and that is what the Democratic proposal argued successfully and that is what we are arguing in this package come, we hope, Thursday or later this week.

So we have to focus on the good of this bill, that it is fair and that what the American people and the people back home in my district in Oregon have passed and demanded of us is deficit reduction.

There is no magic to deficit reduction. They have asked for spending cuts. We have passed the budget bill earlier this spring in March or early April and there are real spending cuts there. They are there. There are \$3 in spending cuts for every new dollar in new investments.

In other words, for every dollar of new investment that goes to things like new police officers in our communities, which is part of this budget reconciliation bill, to national service, to child immunization programs which saves us health care dollars in the long run, and is only fair and humane to the little child in America, to defense conversion, to take all those defense workers, whether in southern California or the State of Missouri and other places in this country, and help them from the transition of a very good defense-related job, which is as we know dead-end economics, into a much more productive job that they are trained to do, whether it is building mass transit buses, whether it is rebuilding the infrastructure in America.

□ 1900

These are good Americans with a great American work ethic, and the only thing they know how to do is not, not, build a bomb, is to not build an MX missile, that, showing a limitation

of their educational ability, they are able to put those work ethics and that knowledge into skill, into something that is productive for the world and our society that has potential for this country and for our society.

There are over 200 cuts in spending programs, \$250 billion in deficit reduction through spending cuts. The cuts are there. There is no magic, Madam Speaker, to this.

It also takes tax increases. It is hard to say, it is hard to say, and we on the committee targetted those tax increases to where it could be fairly applied. We ask the top 2,700 corporations in this country who make over \$10 billion a year in profits to pay a little bit more for America. We ask the millionaires in this country, the millionaires who do not have to worry about paying their rent, buying their food, to pay a little bit more to reduce the deficit in America.

And why is that so important? President Clinton talked about that for this past year. He has talked about it for the last 120 days. It does not get enough attention.

All one has to do is watch the stock market reports and look at the interest rates. Interest rates continue to remain low. The reports are they will continue to be low and may even drop further if, if, Congress does its job.

The President has done his. It is our responsibility to keep those, to keep those, interest rates low, and why? Why are they being lowered? Because the market is responding to the leadership of Bill Clinton who says, "Yes, I'm going to cut the deficit in half."

Now, if we do not follow through, I am afraid those interest rates are going to skyrocket, and what does that mean in terms of dollars and cents to the American taxpayer's pocket?

Let us take housing. A number of individuals in my State and throughout the country have refinanced their homes, or they have gotten the long term, the long term, mortgage that they were afraid they would never be able to pay because that balloon payment was right around the corner, and, instead of paying 10 or 12 percent home mortgage interest, they are now paying 7 or 7 1/4 percent interest, and the bank said, "Put on new employees to keep up with the demand of this refinancing program." That means more money for every homeowner in America.

And look at a State like mine that is so dependent on the wood products and forest products industry and at that first-time home buyer. They can now buy that great American dream, their own home, because they have not in their lifetimes—I am certain they have never seen interest rates this low, and this is the time for them to buy.

But those days will be limited if Congress does not respond to the President's challenge and keep the interest rates low by halving the deficit. That is our mission this week.

How else does this help the American taxpayer directly? I say to my colleagues, "You go to your local public school or your local government, and they're going to go out into the bond market to build that new school building because the one is outdated, or it got hit by an earthquake as truly happened in my district, or the numbers of students have grown and they need a new elementary school, and they're going to finance by going to the bond market to finance that."

These interest rates have a direct influence on that bond market as well because, if those bond interest rates are lower, that means that the local property tax payer, as it is in my home State, is going to pay less for those bonds to build that new school, and it is the same with local government financing whether it is some sort of very expensive infrastructure, a sewage treatment plant that is needed to bring in that new industry. It is cheaper, it is cheaper for those taxpayers, if we keep those interest rates low.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle failed to explain the positives about this piece of legislation. They have centered only on, it seems, the Btu tax. They are not talking about this. But imagine if your local government is finally able to go build that water treatment facility or build that school. That is what we are talking about specifically for Americans to truly understand.

The unity tax is a difficult piece of legislation. I am from the Northwest. Water runs downhill, and that is how we make electricity in the Northwest. It is cheap. It is energy efficient to the tune of 85 percent. It is cost effective. Yes, it hurts the fish runs in my region. My region has spent a billion dollars over the last 10 years to fix those fish runs, and we will do it, and we will spend millions and hundreds of millions of dollars more.

But we have the luxury of lower, compared to other regions of the country, lower cost energy. No doubt about it. We get a benefit from that. We get energy intensive industry coming out to the Northwest. We have forests that are there, and it is no accident, therefore, that we have the paper-manufacturing businesses in the Northwest because we have the resources, that is, the trees, and we also have the lower cost energy which makes us competitive on a world market.

So, when they come to me and say—the President comes to say, "We all should pay a little bit more energy tax," I wince. I go back home to my district, and I talk to people.

The aluminum industry said, "Yes, we'll pay more of an energy tax to run our plants, but in terms of the chemical process we want a break."

I say, "Justify that."

They give me the science.

The President's tax bill—it is called the feedstock. I learned more about

feedstock than I ever thought I would when I was in a sixth grade class, but the President allowed oil as a feedstock exemption. They allowed coal as a feedstock exemption. I argued that electricity as a feedstock ought to be exempted as well. He gave me 50 percent. He met me halfway. That was good enough for me.

For now we will see what our friends on the Senate might do to refine this, but it is a good bill, and my aluminum industries in the Northwest are supported because they understand the moral of reducing the deficit, that they will save their money, too, when they go to the financing institutions and ask for a business expansion loan. They know they are going to get a better interest rate for that.

Reference was made to the border adjustment bureau that will have to be set up. Yes, and that was compromised. That came from the committee—not from the President, but from the committee. Said, "Look, if we're going to impose this energy tax, yes, aluminum, for example, is a worldwide competitive market. We have some energy intensive industries as the paper industry, as other manufacturing concerns who use a lot of energy, but it's not part of a chemical process. What are we going to do to make sure that the playing field is as level as possible because we are in an international economy?"

And what the Congressman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], came up with was a border adjustment tax so that, when there are energy intensive imports into this country, that they pay a like tax as that similar industry in America so that we are leveling the playing field, and we are taxing energy in this country and on those competitive products that are international in scope.

Is that good policy? You bet. It is going to force industries into reexamining the energy wastes in their products? You bet. Is that good for energy policy in this country and throughout the world? You bet. You bet it is, and we can take this home and proudly say we are finally taxing energy in this country at a rate that will encourage energy conservation and make these industries much more efficient in the production and use of energy because the fact is businesses will do this because they know it is a direct way they can cut costs. At the same time, at the same time, they know that, if they are energy efficient, they will be helping to reduce further our Federal deficit.

It is phased in, does not go into effect until the summer of 1994, so businesses can adjust. The American consumer can adjust. Perhaps they can insulate their home a little bit more, save money over the long term. Anyway, they ought to do it.

Is this good energy policy for the American consumer? You bet it is.

The Btu tax, the energy tax, is going to be phased in, as I say, beginning in

the summer of 1994, and phased in in three equal stages over a 3-year period.

□ 1910

A family making \$40,000 household income a year will pay \$1 a month more. Twelve bucks a year, folks. That is what we are asking for your contribution to reduce the deficit and to think energy conservation at home.

In 1995, it will be \$7, and then only \$17 a month when it is fully phased in, according to both the Treasury Department and the Congressional Budget Office. So 4 years from now you will be paying \$17 more a month if you have a household income of \$40,000.

We have established a deficit-reduction trust fund. We have a credibility problem in the Congress and the administration about deficit reduction. There is no problem about it. So the gentleman from New York has come up with this idea, agreed to by the President, that we will take the deficit money and put it in this trust fund to show that we truly are halving the deficit by about \$246 billion.

Let me talk about this deficit reduction. Our colleagues on the other side in the minority party point out the number, what happens when this plan comes into effect and how much the debt will be.

The true question is, If we do nothing, how great will the deficit be? It will grow by another \$246 billion if we do nothing.

The President is asking to cut the proposed deficit in half. That is what we are talking about, spending cuts. That is why we are talking about revenue increases, fairly applied to millionaires in this country and the richest corporations.

Madam Speaker, let me also talk about one other provision in this bill called the earned income tax credit, the EITC. This is probably one of the best social policy programs that this Congress has adopted in the past 6 or 8 years. It has great partisan support, because it gives a tax credit to those that work.

The President has long talked about the concept of making work pay in this country. What he has done is has asked this country to ensure that anybody in this Nation who is working full time, that they should not be living in poverty. That is what the earned income tax credit is all about. He has proposed an expansion which we on the Committee on Ways and Means fully endorsed so that we finally get to that level of coverage for the tax credit so that anybody who is working full time in America, whether they have children or not, will not be living below the poverty level.

It is very simple. It costs a little bit of money, yes, and I explained where we are getting the revenue to pay that. We are going to ask the millionaires to help fund this earned income tax credit, and they will.

So if you are making up to \$26,000 a year, and depending upon the number of children you have, the numbers will work out that you apply for this credit, you will receive it, and the credit will be such that you will not be living below the poverty line in America.

We are making work pay. Through the President's leadership he is saying we should take away the incentive to stay on welfare. You should not be able to have more household income if you are on welfare than if you are working, even if it is a minimum wage job.

There are so many benefits to work, to having a job in this country, such as the role model that you provide for your children and your own self-esteem. The President is saying you should not be penalized for taking that minimum wage job, and that is why we are offering this great expansion of this earned tax credit.

I think that this is very significant to the American people. It is the first major step in welfare reform that the President is going to be presenting to the Congress later this year. It is almost as important as the deficit-reduction issue. Yet people on the other side of the aisle are not talking about this earned income tax credit and suggesting that maybe it is a very difficult vote. They are making it sound like it is very easy.

We are proposing an energy tax, and therefore it is a bad bill, and we should vote no. If this was all there was to this bill I would vote no myself. But we are spending the money on deficit reduction from the energy tax. We are spending the money on making work pay in this country. That is what we are doing in this piece of legislation.

As I mentioned before, we talked about the investment tax credit. It got so complicated that the only full employment program would be for the accountants and the tax lawyers in this country, and we shelved it.

We said what can we do that is very simple for the small business people in this country that would help stimulate the economy right now? What we did was say OK, right now they get in their business expenses, they get automatic business expense under current law \$10,000.

The President said if you are going to take away the ITC, I want you to raise the expensing level to \$25,000.

We said Mr. President, why don't you just double it, \$20,000? That ought to be enough.

He said no, \$25,000 or nothing, keep current law.

He was tough, and he is right. And I ran into Lois Kenagy, a farmer, a wonderful woman out in my district, very much involved in the peace movement. She came in to talk to me about the nuclear disarmament issue.

She said, "Explain to me this expensing thing again." I explained it to her.

She said, "OK, great. I can finally buy that diesel tractor that I have been needing for my farm."

She is going to go out, if we do our job, and buy that diesel tractor. That is jobs for America right away.

It is simple. Lois Kenagy, who does not have an accounting degree or tax degree, but is a smart business person, knows what it means to her and is going to take advantage of it. I would say to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we are talking about this great issue for our small businesses in this country, which we know create most of the jobs in this country.

So, Madam Speaker, we are talking about tax fairness. It is tough. We are talking about real spending cuts. They will be tough as well, because we will hear from our local governments, who all of a sudden will say why are you cutting back? We will say because we do not have a balanced budget, and you do.

Or a constituent will come and say why aren't you helping us in that spending program any longer? I am saying because we have got to get our economic house in order. We have got to cut the deficit, and we have got to get to the day when we have a balanced budget.

We are making work pay. We have the earned income tax credit that will be fully expanded so work will pay in this country, that somebody going to work will not be living under the poverty level in the richest, most powerful nation on Earth. And, yes, we will have an energy policy and energy tax in this country that will encourage every individual in this country to conserve energy, to wrap that material around their hot water tank and make sure their hot water pipes are wrapped and that they put good insulation in those buildings.

That is what we are talking about. We are talking about efficiency in business.

So this is a good economic program for America. It is tough, but it is fair. I hope on Thursday we are able to move this bill over to the other side of the Capitol.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

(By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:)

Mr. LEACH (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WILLIAMS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and tomorrow, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. COPPERSMITH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal business.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEKAS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINNIS, for 60 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 20 minutes, on May 26.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, on May 25.

Mr. BECERRA, for 60 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 60 minutes, on May 25, 26, and 27.

Mr. SLATTERY, for 60 minutes, on May 26.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan, for 1 hour, on May 25.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan, for 60 minutes, on May 26.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEKAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. CLINGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. MATSUI in two instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. KLEIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. SWIFT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KOPETSKI. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The Motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1259. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(d)(3) (104 Stat. 1812); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1260. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report of activities and efforts relating to utilization of the private sector, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1261. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of Final Regulations—Department of Education Acquisition Regulation, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1262. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Information and Public Affairs, Department of Labor, transmitting fiscal year 1992 annual report; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1263. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of each of the reports, Summary of Chapter 2 Annual Reports and Summary of Chapter 2 State Self-Evaluations of Effectiveness; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1264. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting, a copy of the Energy Information Administration's "Profiles of Foreign Direct Investment in U.S. Energy 1991"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1265. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain compliance by Iraq with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to Public Law 102-1, section 3 (105 Stat. 4) (H. Doc. No. 103-88); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1266. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting the original report of political contributions for James Richard Creek, of Arkansas, to be Ambassador to Argentina, and members of

his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions for Christie Ramsay, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1268. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1269. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the actuarial reports on the Judicial Retirement System, the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System, and the Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement System for the plan year ending September 30, 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1270. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1271. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the private counsel debt collection project for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3718(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1272. A letter from the Acting Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 to include the National Science Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1273. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1274. A letter from the Walla Walla District, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting copies of the report of the Secretary of the Army on Civil Work Activities for fiscal year 1992, Department of the Army Corps of Engineers extract report of the Walla Walla District; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1275. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting research findings on Medicare Home Health Agency Prospective Payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1276. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting on behalf of the Secretary of State certification required under section 609(b) of Public Law 101-162, regarding the incidental capture of sea turtles in commercial shrimping operations, pursuant to Public Law 101-162, section 609(a)(5)(C) (103 Stat. 1038); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

1277. A letter from the Principal Deputy Comptroller, Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting the quarterly report on program activities for facilitation of weapons destruction and nonproliferation in the former Soviet Union for the period January 1, 1993, through March 31, 1993, and cumulatively; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

1278. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmit-

ting the annual report on the Natural Resource Development Program (tree planting) for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-515, section 4; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Small Business.

1279. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on Medicare for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 139511(b); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1280. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the implementation of special debt relief for the poorest, most heavily indebted countries, in the multilateral context of the Paris Club, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1281. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 and 1995 for the U.S. Information Agency and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GLICKMAN: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 1723. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program under which employees of the Central Intelligence Agency may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action; with an amendment (Rept. 103-102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. A report on a citizen's guide on using the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act of 1974 to request Government records (Rept. 103-104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2244. A bill making supplemental appropriations, transfers, and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 1340. A bill to provide funding for the resolution of failed savings associations, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than June 11, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendments as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(i), rule X (Rept. 103-103, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolu-

were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to require that testimony before the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission be given under oath; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 2238. A bill to amend laws relating to Federal procurement, to authorize functions and activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 2239. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mr. MCCREY):

H.R. 2240. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote savings for qualified higher education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2241. A bill to provide for the establishment of a committee to assist the Secretary of Health and Human Services in developing new criteria and standards for audits of State child support programs, and to require the Secretary to promulgate regulations to modify such audits to emphasize program outcomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 2242. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to encourage voluntary environmental cleanup of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend the authorization of appropriations in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. Res. 181. Resolution providing for the termination of official funding of certain legislative service organizations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

148. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal dollar assistance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

149. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, relative to the atrocities in Bosnia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

150. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, relative to commonwealth status to the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

151. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal "riders"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

152. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to Inter-

state 69; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

153. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

154. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to an Economic Conversion Task Force; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 81: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 173: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 212: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 245: Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HORN, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 250: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 266: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 349: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. GRAMS.

H.R. 407: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 441: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 507: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 649: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 697: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 700: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 703: Mr. CRANE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 725: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 746: Mr. BEILSON.

H.R. 749: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. McMILLAN.

H.R. 762: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 767: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 799: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 826: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 833: Mr. EVANS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 864: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 882: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 930: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1098: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1141: Mr. WOLF, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 1200: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1238: Mr. MACHTELEY.

H.R. 1240: Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1302: Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 1402: Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 1403: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1407: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 1455: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1490: Mr. WILSON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. LONG, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1520: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 1545: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1546: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1548: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1555: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1608: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SYNAR, Ms. THURMAN, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1636: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1670: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1684: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WATT, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1697: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1727: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1819: Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1843: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1874: Mr. HYDE and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1925: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

H.R. 1928: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1944: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1948: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 1989: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HOKE, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 1999: Mr. COBLE, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2019: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2025: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 2059: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 2076: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 2094: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2157: Mr. FROST, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2219: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MANN, and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. UPTON.

H.J. Res. 88: Mr. NADLER.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. PETE GEREN.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. KIM, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SAWYER, and Ms. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 119: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. COOPER and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.J. Res. 158: Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Con. Res. 37: Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. YATES, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. KLEIN.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. CASTLE.

H. Con. Res. 80: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DE LUGO.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CANADY, Mr. FAWELL and Mr. GUNDERSON.

